

Also, petition of C. T. Russell, favoring the Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Standard Bleachery Co., of Carlton Hill, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 8119, for the relief of Mary E. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of F. W. Thurston Co., of Chicago, favoring the Hill bill, H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., urging prompt passage of House bill 702, relating to the dyestuff situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of the Winsted Hosiery Co., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Guardian Savings & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio., protesting against stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. M. Pattison Supply Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 50,000 members of the German-American Alliance, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on war munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Woolen Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 84, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ashland; Clinton W. Shearer and S. B. Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ribber Manufacturing Co., of Pottsville, Pa., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Hockannin Mills, of Rockville, Conn., favoring passage of a bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petitions of business men of Murfreesboro, Petersburg, Lewisburg, Smyrna, Manchester, Shelbyville, Fayetteville, and Tullahoma, Tenn., favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Capt. Santwein and all other officers and enlisted men of Company C, First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Melklejohn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lymanville Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bill protecting manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Milaca, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Eden Valley, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Rice, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Memorial of Branch 108, Paving Cutters' Union of United States and Canada, Willards Point, Me., favoring law preventing importation of foreign-made paving blocks to be sold at prices below reasonable cost of production in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., favoring adequate measures to prevent shipping congestion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. D. Pierce, of Pine City, N. Y., favoring a uniform divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Religious Society of Friends, of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, relative to violation of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Traffic Club of New York and Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of sundry banking and trust companies of Texas, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry business men of the State of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of veterans of the Confederate Army, favoring law granting pensions to widows and minor children of Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Woman's Missionary Society of Colorado, Tex., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Toledo (Ohio) Scale Co., against passage of House bill 150, to regulate weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Baraca class of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, of Utica, N. Y., favoring law censoring moving-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring assistance to relieve conditions relative to the congestion of freight at railway terminals in United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the fixing of railway-mail pay by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of Local Union 682 and District No. 2, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, and Kentucky State Federation of Labor, asking that the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations be printed in full; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of the Boulder Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, as fair to both shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast enabled us out of various kindred peoples and tongues to erect a great empire dedicated to exact and equal justice and to the freedom of all. We bless Thee for the privileges of freedom. We come to Thee continually that we may be taught that higher liberty wherewith Thou dost make men free. Give to us the Divine inspiration that a conscience quickened by Divine wisdom may rightly decide all the issues of life. Give us the power by that spiritual appropriation that we may not be bound in the prison house of a merely sensuous intellect. God grant to lead us in the realm of the higher and eternal, that we may perform our functions not only as citizens of this state but of the higher kingdom. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator elect from Idaho, is in the Chamber and desires to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will present his colleague at the Vice President's desk that the oath may be administered to him.

Mr. BRADY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. BORAH, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, at yesterday's session of the Senate my colleague [Mr. PHELAN] had printed in the RECORD some matter relating to the Hetch Hetchy grant. I was very earnestly opposed to the grant at the time the bill was before the Senate, because, in my judgment, the city of San Francisco did not need the water and it was needed by the owners of land in San Joaquin Valley, as it would irrigate hundreds of thou-

sands of acres, and also because it would impose upon the city of San Francisco an enormous unnecessary debt.

As the matter has again been brought before the Senate, I desire to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle bearing upon the whole matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 11, 1916.]

SPRING VALLEY AND HETCH HETCHY—THE MAYOR AGAIN FAILS TO GIVE A CLEAR STATEMENT OF POLICY.

In his annual address the mayor advocates the uninterrupted development of the Hetch Hetchy water source and also calls upon the railroad commission to appraise such parts of the Spring Valley system as we desire with the view of again submitting to the people a proposal for purchase.

What the mayor fails to do is to give such an analysis of the city's financial condition as will demonstrate our ability to finance both enterprises.

And such a failure is inexcusable. It is suggestive of blind going ahead in the hope of muddling through somehow, which is the direct road to bankruptcy in private business.

The Chronicle does not know and can not see how the city can finance both enterprises at once. The city and county attorney, when advocating the purchase of Spring Valley, declared the double financing to be impossible, and that the Hetch Hetchy water must be "left to the next generation." Nobody has ever suggested a way by which, under our debt limit, we could buy Spring Valley and develop Hetch Hetchy.

Therefore, if the mayor sees a way, it is his official duty to explain it to the people. He does not do so. The conclusion must therefore be that he can not, and that he has no intention of developing the Hetch Hetchy water supply, but agrees with the city and county attorney that if we buy Spring Valley the Hetch Hetchy supply must be left to the next generation.

That being apparently the inevitable conclusion, the assumption must be that the mayor's policy is to acquire the Spring Valley property and construct a power plant on the Tuolumne River.

We suppose, in fact, that to be the mayor's policy. The question then arises by what right money voted for a water supply can be used to construct a power plant.

And, if it is held that the power-plant reservoir will be useful for the next generation as a source of water supply, the question still arises by what right, legal or moral, money voted to procure a water supply for those now living can be used to construct a power plant on the chance that posterity will desire to bring the impounded water to this city.

There is another aspect to the case. Assuming that money voted for a water supply can be used to build a power plant, that certainly ought not to be done unless the power plant when built will be profitable.

It can only be profitable by the use of the power generated, for the city is forbidden to sell current at a profit. It can not be profitable unless the cost of the power delivered is enough less than the price at which it can be bought to make the profit.

And if the saving is so large, it can and should be demonstrated. And whether it will be profitable or not, the people are entitled to have the figures. Why does not the mayor give them?

REPORT ON LITIGATION OVER WITHDRAWN OIL LANDS (H. DOC. NO. 593).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting a supplement to his annual report for the fiscal year 1915, embodying a report upon the litigation over withdrawn oil lands of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 403. An act granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery;

H. R. 3636. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909;

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River;

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition signed by the commissioners of Polson, Mont., in favor of an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for Flathead reclamation project in that State. The petition is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the signatures, there being only three of them, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLSON, MONT., January 1, 1916.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We the undersigned commissioners of Polson, Mont., do most urgently request of Congress that they pass an appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000 for work on the Flathead project for the ensuing year.

If this project is to be completed in an efficient, businesslike, and economical manner, it is necessary that the appropriations for construction work on the project be very materially increased.

It means much to the citizens and taxpayers of this city whether or not this project is to be completed within a reasonable length of time.

We trust you will give this matter the consideration it deserves and grant the very largest possible amount for this most worthy purpose.

Respectfully submitted.

J. W. CLARK, Mayor.

E. N. STOUGHTON, Councilman.

H. W. DOUGLAS, Councilman.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Corn- ing, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National School of Civic Evangelism, of Chicago, Ill., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, for the prohibition of the shipment of New England rum and other intoxicants to Africa, and to prohibit interstate transmission of race gambling odds and bets, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the National School of Civic Evangelism, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for prohibition in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waverly, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of Local Branch No. 108, Paving Cutters' Union of the United States and Canada, of Willards Point, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the paving-block industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a telegram and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, N. Y.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Censorship of motion pictures is the most dangerous attack on American liberties since the foundation of the Republic. The motion picture is a process of recording thought on yellow parchment without the use of printer's ink, and is as great an advance on printings as Gutenberg's invention was over the quill pen. The printing press revolutionized the world by bringing knowledge within the reach of thousands. The motion picture brings knowledge within the reach of hundreds of millions. To strangle this great art in its infancy will be a crime against humanity. Free speech is the foundation of our Republic. There is no reason for censorship. The motion picture is now cleaner than the spoken drama or the press. The police powers of the State are already ample. Any citizen can close any theater within an hour if the laws of morality are violated. A censorship of opinion is the aim of our enemies. Our fathers fled the Old World to escape this and founded the Republic to free the human mind from such shackles. Shall we go back to the dark ages? I first preached the Clansman as a sermon. No censor dared to silence my pulpit. I turned my sermon into a lecture and delivered it from Maine to California without license. I turned the lecture into a novel, and no censor has yet stopped the press of Doubleday, Page & Co. I turned the novel into a spoken play, and no censor has dared to interfere. I turned the play into a motion picture, and it has cost me \$75,000 in lawyers' fees to fight the local censors the first 10 months. This condition of affairs is infamous. It is the immediate duty of Congress to reaffirm the principles of free speech in America and abolish all censors.

THOMAS DIXON.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Adrian, Mich., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, kerosene, or crude oil, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Marquette, Mich., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Nogales, Ariz., remonstrating against the recent massacre of Americans in Mexico and praying for action by the

United States Government in relation thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Safford, Ariz., praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid to the railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against any alliance by the United States with European countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Federation Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, of Abilene, Kans., praying for the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented memorials of sundry citizens of South Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BRADY presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Boise, Idaho, and a petition of the Socialist Party of Local View, Idaho, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Homedale and Cambridge, in the State of Idaho, praying for the imposition of a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Highway Commission of Idaho, praying for an appropriation for the construction of a highway from Ashton, Idaho, through Targhee National Forest to Yellowstone Park, Wyo., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the congregation of the Christ Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Bronx Co. and of Titus Blatter & Co., of New York City, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a copy of a series of resolutions against war preparations, adopted by the Larimer County Farmers' Union, at Loveland, Colo., at a meeting held on December 3, 1915, and also against a large standing Army or any change in a military system tending to compulsory military service. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions against war preparations adopted by the Larimer County Farmers' Union at Loveland, Colo., at a meeting held on December 3, 1915.

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that the coming session of Congress will be asked to make greatly increased appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the National Guard, and for other purposes, included in a program to prepare this Republic for war; and

Whereas more than 60 per cent of all Federal revenues are now used for war expenses, a burden that is already too heavy to be borne by producers without protest; and

Whereas the National Farmers' Union in convention at Lincoln, Nebr., representing the organized farmers of 31 States, adopted the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That we demand economy in all appropriations made by Congress and that we are especially opposed to any great increase in expenditures for the Army and Navy, but approve a reasonable outlay for coast defense by submarines or other weapons proved by recent experience to be effective for that purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to a large standing Army and to any change in our military system tending to compulsory military service."

Therefore we, the members of the Larimer County Farmers' Union, in regular meeting, declare and order:

First. That we are opposed to the proposed plan for making appropriations amounting within the next five years to more than \$2,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy and other war preparedness.

Second. That we reaffirm and indorse the resolutions of the National Farmers' Union against huge appropriations for war preparedness and particularly against a great standing Army and a change in our military system that we believe, if adopted, would ultimately result in universal compulsory military service.

Third. We demand that our Senators and Congressmen vote against the proposed program for military preparedness and use all their influence to prevent any such measure from being enacted into law.

Fourth. We indorse the position of our official organ, The National Field, in opposing unnecessary appropriations for war preparedness and Army and Navy increases.

Fifth. That copies of these resolutions bearing the signature of the president and attested by the secretary be sent to the Senators from Colorado and to our Representative in Congress from the second district, the Hon. CHARLES B. TIMBELLAKE, and to the local papers of this county for publication.

Sixth. We demand that the Congress redeem all pledges made to the farmers and proceed at once to enact a rural credit law, a law against gambling in produce, options on boards of trade, a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection, and a law creating a national bureau of markets, all of which were indorsed by the national convention of the Farmers' Union at Lincoln on September 8, 1915.

[SEAL.]

LARIMER COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
P. H. BOOTHROYD, President.
L. H. FAGAN, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Eva M. Bowman (Rept. No. 46); and

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Omer D. Lewis (Rept. No. 47).

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the District of Columbia and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 45) thereon.

Mr. NELSON. On yesterday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] submitted an amendment to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce. Through inadvertence the amendment was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It should have gone to the Committee on Commerce. I move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

FISCAL AFFAIRS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 247).

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably with an amendment the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] on January 14, being Senate Resolution No. 68 to print the manuscript entitled "Report of the joint select committee appointed under the act of March 3, 1915," as a Senate document. There is considerable demand for it. The matter is in type, and these copies can be run off without any trouble. The committee propose to increase the number from 850 to 1,600 copies. I ask unanimous consent to have it considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, in line 8, before the words: "additional copies," to strike out "eight hundred and fifty" and insert "one thousand six hundred," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the report of the joint select committee appointed under the act approved March 3, 1915, to determine the fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 495), together with the hearings held thereon, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a Senate document, and that 1,600 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 3615) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Payette, Idaho; and

A bill (S. 3616) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Blackfoot, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3617) for the relief of Elizabeth Davis; and

A bill (S. 3618) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide the southeast quarter of section 18, township 46 north,

range 4 west, Boise meridian (the same being that portion of the town site of Plummer, Benewah County, Idaho, not yet platted), into 5-acre tracts for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3619) to advance funds for the construction of a road within the Targhee National Forest, in the State of Idaho, and the Madison National Forest, in the State of Montana (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3620) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining experiment, mine safety, and mine assay stations, for making investigations and preparing and issuing information to those engaged in mining, for keeping records of mining properties, for making assays for prospectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 3621) for the relief of John J. Muehleisen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3622) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Overholtz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Cochran;

A bill (S. 3624) granting an increase of pension to James A. Saurbaugh;

A bill (S. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 3626) granting an increase of pension to Leonard E. Griffiths;

A bill (S. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Casey;

A bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to James McNamara (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mullen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Davis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3631) granting an increase of pension to John J. Foraker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3632) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Platt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3633) granting an increase of pension to John Curtis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. C. O'Connor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Simon Jensen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3636) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3637) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Graham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3638) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Simpson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3639) granting a pension to Philip Hutchinson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3640) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Abel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3641) granting a pension to George W. Bass (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3642) granting a pension to Daniel A. Williams (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Viola C. McConville (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3644) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China; and

A bill (S. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Edward Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3646) to amend the act of February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., p. 807), providing for the opening of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3647) for the relief of Moses C. Tingley; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 3648) for the relief of M. A. Sweeney Shipyards & Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 3649) to establish a fish-cultural station on Lumber River, in Moore County, N. C.; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 3650) to convert the premises connected with Fort Johnston, in the town of Southport, N. C., into a public park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3651) for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3652) granting an increase of pension to Jamison S. Tweed (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3653) granting a pension to Charles A. Stockard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3654) granting a pension to Mary E. Gosnell; and

A bill (S. 3655) granting a pension to Bertha Z. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Whitfield H. Lance; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3657) for the removal of the college women's dormitory and the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a new dormitory at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3658) to establish a naval academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3659) to establish a military academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of War; and

A bill (S. 3660) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3661) to improve the aids to navigation at the entrance to Willapa Bay, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3662) authorizing the leasing of the lands embraced within the Hoh Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3663) making timberlands available for homestead settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3664) for the relief of William W. Danenhower (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 3665) to amend act of October 3, 1913, known as income-tax law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENYON (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3666) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley;

A bill (S. 3667) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gray; and

A bill (S. 3668) granting an increase of pension to Hanson Hutchings, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3669) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, to provide for certain penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3670) to establish a military academy at Fort Snelling, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Allen (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3672) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

A bill (S. 3673) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Curtis Buck to a certain piece of land located in Michigan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3674) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Blackmar, now Mary E. Bruson; and

A bill (S. 3675) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Newell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3676) for the relief of Joseph Stoich (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3677) granting an increase of pension to Larkin Russell; and

A bill (S. 3678) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Bratton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Foster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 3680) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for

injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Neb., February 21, 1909 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3681) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Esparta*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3682) granting a pension to Nettie Lay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3683) granting an increase of pension to Millard C. Loveless (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3684) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Dear (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3685) granting certain lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the insane hospital for the colored; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STONE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Mr. René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba (with accompanying paper); and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) providing for a survey of Bakers Bay, near the mouth of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 83) for the relief of James L. Cardwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. BORAH. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60), creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, which was reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and is now on the calendar. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table and that the joint resolution and amendment be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table and be printed, and the joint resolution and amendment were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress as expeditiously as may be; that the sum of \$25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BORAH to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

On page 3, line 13, after the word commerce," insert the following: "also the subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities and as to the comparative worth and efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and regulation."

WILLIAM SCHULDT.

Mr. BRADY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$101 to credit to the account of William Schuldt, of Lewiston, Idaho, for traveling expenses on official business, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COST OF ARMOR PLATE AND ARMOR PLANT.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 500 additional copies of House Document No. 193, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the Board of Naval Officers appointed under the act of March 3, 1905, as to cost of armor plate and armor plant," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. SMOOT. Has that report already been printed as a Senate document?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been printed as a House document.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have been told by the printing clerk of the Senate that it will cost about \$125.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of cost; the House which has ordered the printing of a document should also order its reprinting when necessary.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, however, happens to want this document, and the supply is exhausted in both document rooms.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs desires the document, they should have it. I am not saying that they should not; but, as I said, if the House in the first instance ordered the printing of the document, it thereby became a House document, and if an increased number is desired that increase should be ordered by the House which ordered it printed in the first instance.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not hear what the document was, and I ask the Senator from South Carolina to inform me.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is Niles's report on armor plate.

Mr. PENROSE. That document ought to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I repeat, the supply of this document is exhausted in both document rooms.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, however, that the chairman of the Committee on Printing can order \$200 worth of printing without any action on the part of the Senate; and I suggest to him that he withdraw the resolution and request the chairman of the Committee on Printing to give the order to the Public Printer for the printing of 500 copies of the document for the use of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing that the Senator from Utah shall proceed in his own way, so that I get the document printed. That is all I want.

Mr. SMOOT. The way I suggest would be best.

Mr. TILLMAN. Under the assurance of the Senator from Utah that he will take care of the printing of the document, I withdraw the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is withdrawn.

RIGHTS OF FOREIGN TRADE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, for several days past the papers have had a good deal to say about the probable extension of the order of blockade by Great Britain, and the implication has been in these publications that by such an order some additional power would be given to the allies to restrict the trade of neutrals through neutral ports in neutral goods. In point of fact, there is nothing upon which to base such a claim. No such additional power would be given.

I hold in my hand a portion of the letter of the State Department to Great Britain of date March 30, 1915, which really covers this question. In discussing the orders of March 1 and March 11 the rights under a blockade to interfere with neutral trade to neutral ports in neutral goods by opposing belligerents is considered. I ask that this page and a half be printed in the Record, and in connection with doing so I will read just one paragraph from it:

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to un-

blockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

I ask that this page and a half from this letter of the State Department be printed in the RECORD. I think just at this time it is very interesting.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

(The Secretary of State to Ambassador W. H. Page.)

No. 1348.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1915.

You are instructed to deliver the following to His Majesty's Government, in reply to your Nos. 1795 and 1798, of March 15:

The Government of the United States has given careful consideration to the subjects treated in the British notes of March 13 and March 15 and to the British order in council of the latter date.

These communications contain matters of grave importance to neutral nations. They appear to menace their rights of trade and intercourse, not only with belligerents but also with one another. They call for frank comment in order that misunderstandings may be avoided. The Government of the United States deems it its duty, therefore, speaking in the sincerest spirit of friendship, to make its own view and position with regard to them unmistakably clear.

The order in council of the 15th of March would constitute, were its provisions to be actually carried into effect as they stand, a practical assertion of unlimited belligerent rights over neutral commerce within the whole European area, and an almost unqualified denial of the sovereign rights of the nations now at peace.

This Government takes it for granted that there can be no question what those rights are. A nation's sovereignty over its own ships and citizens under its own flag on the high seas in time of peace is, of course, unlimited; and that sovereignty suffers no diminution in time of war, except in so far as the practice and consent of civilized nations has limited it by the recognition of certain now clearly determined rights, which it is conceded may be exercised by nations which are at war.

A belligerent nation has been conceded the right of visit and search, and the right of capture and condemnation, if upon examination a neutral vessel is found to be engaged in unneutral service or to be carrying contraband of war intended for the enemy's government or armed forces. It has been conceded the right to establish and maintain a blockade of an enemy's ports and coasts and to capture and condemn any vessel taken in trying to break the blockade. It is even conceded the right to detain and take to its own ports for judicial examination all vessels which it suspects for substantial reasons to be engaged in unneutral or contraband service and to condemn them if the suspicion is sustained. But such rights, long clearly defined both in doctrine and practice, have hitherto been held to be the only permissible exceptions to the principle of universal equality of sovereignty on the high seas as between belligerents and nations not engaged in war.

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to unblockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

Moreover, the rules of the declaration of Paris of 1856—among them that free ships make free goods—will hardly at this day be disputed by the signatories of that solemn agreement.

His Majesty's Government, like the Government of the United States, have often and explicitly held that these rights represent the best usage of warfare in the dealings of belligerents with neutrals at sea. In this connection I desire to direct attention to the opinion of the Chief Justice of the United States in the case of the *Peterhof*, which arose out of the Civil War, and to the fact that that opinion was unanimously sustained in the award of the Arbitration Commission of 1871, to which the case was presented at the request of Great Britain. From that time to the declaration of London of 1909, adopted with modifications by the order in council of the 23d of October last, these rights have not been seriously questioned by the British Government. And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain, which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances; and for Great Britain to make such a claim would be for her to abandon and set at naught the principles for which she has consistently and earnestly contended in other times and circumstances.

The note of His Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs which accompanies the order in council, and which bears the same date, notifies the Government of the United States of the establishment of a blockade which is, if defined by the terms of the order in council, to include all the coasts and ports of Germany and every port of possible access to enemy territory. But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts, bars access to them, and subjects all neutral ships seeking to approach them to the same suspicion that would attach to them were they bound for the ports of the enemies of Great Britain, and to unusual risks and penalties.

It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas, beyond the right of visit and search and the right to prevent the shipment of contraband already referred to, are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce is interfered with.

The Government of the United States is, of course, not oblivious to the great changes which have occurred in the conditions and means of naval warfare since the rules hitherto governing legal blockade were formulated. It might be ready to admit that the old form of "close" blockade, with its cordon of ships in the immediate offing of the blockaded ports, is no longer practicable in face of an enemy possessing the means and opportunity to make an effective defense by the use of

submarines, mines, and air craft; but it can hardly be maintained that, whatever form of effective blockade may be made use of, it is impossible to conform at least to the spirit and principles of the established rules of war. If the necessities of the case should seem to render it imperative that the cordon of blockading vessels be extended across the approaches to any neighboring neutral port or country, it would seem clear that it would still be easily practicable to comply with the well-recognized and reasonable prohibition of international law against the blockading of neutral ports by according free admission and exit to all lawful traffic with neutral ports through the blockading cordon. This traffic would, of course, include all outward-bound traffic from the neutral country and all inward-bound traffic to the neutral country except contraband in transit to the enemy. Such procedure need not conflict in any respect with the rights of the belligerent maintaining the blockade, since the right would remain with the blockading vessels to visit and search all ships either entering or leaving the neutral territory which they were in fact, but not of right, investing.

The Government of the United States notes that in the order in council His Majesty's Government give as their reason for entering upon a course of action, which they are aware is without precedent in modern warfare, the necessity they conceive themselves to have been placed under to retaliate upon their enemies for measures of a similar nature which the latter have announced it their intention to adopt and which they have to some extent adopted; but the Government of the United States, recalling the principles upon which His Majesty's Government have hitherto been scrupulous to act, interprets this as merely a reason for certain extraordinary activities on the part of His Majesty's naval forces and not as an excuse for or prelude to any unlawful action. If the course pursued by the present enemies of Great Britain should prove to be in fact tainted by illegality and disregard of the principles of war sanctioned by enlightened nations, it can not be supposed, and this Government does not for a moment suppose, that His Majesty's Government would wish the same taint to attach to their own actions or would cite such illegal acts as in any sense or degree a justification for similar practices on their part in so far as they affect neutral rights.

It is thus that the Government of the United States interprets the language of the note of His Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs which accompanies the copy of the order in council which was handed to the ambassador of the United States near the Government in London and by him transmitted to Washington.

LECTURE BY HENRY J. PIERCE ON NECESSITY FOR WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is an invitation that I should like to extend to Senators, but after conference with some of those who know about such things it is thought that probably it might create a precedent that we might not like. So I will not extend it, but I will content myself with asking Senators to note the invitation on page 1161 of the RECORD of this morning, in the second column.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have an editorial here from the Evening Times, of Pawtucket, R. I., one of the most considerable papers in that State. I should like to have it read and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary proceeded to read the editorial.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I object to the further reading of that paper. I do not believe it is proper for the Senate to put itself in the attitude of assailing the President of our own country in behalf of or in comparison with a man who is reputed to have been a murderer, cutthroat, and usurper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the document be read?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana was right in objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the document be read?

Mr. STONE. Wait a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable.

Mr. STONE. I ask permission to make a single observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has indicated more than once his intention to object in such cases. I merely wish to say, if I may, that it seems to me while it is probably true that some newspaper writer can state the attitude of some Senators better than they can state it themselves, I hope in the future—and I intended to say this at the conclusion of the reading of this article—we will not have any more of this sort of thing attempted or done in the Senate. If the Senator from Utah will not carry out his frequently declared purpose to object, I shall do so myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the question is, Shall the matter be read. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it. The yeas have it. The matter is stricken from the RECORD.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had, on January 18, 1916, approved and signed the following act:

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of bridges across the Fox River, at Aurora, Ill.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 594).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the reports of the clerk and chief probation officer of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia for the two years ending June 30, 1915, together with a letter of transmittal from the judge of said court.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1916.

NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, BIG SANDY RIVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va., which were, in line 9, after "near," to insert "Warfield, Ky., and" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va."

Mr. BECKHAM. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 403. An act granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

H. R. 3636. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, what reference was made of that bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I am not mistaken in regard to the bill, it ought to go to the Committee on Finance. I understand it was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session of Congress and re-referred to the Committee on Finance. It is a House bill which has been called to my attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

During the transaction of routine business,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if it is appropriate at this time, I desire to move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 be immediately committed to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, that may be done.

Mr. BORAH. Is that the resolution which we have had under discussion?

Mr. LEWIS. It is the resolution, I will answer the Senator from Idaho, introduced by myself touching the question of conferring upon the President authority to cooperate with any other Government in his judgment appropriate in sending such armed force as may be necessary for the protection of American citizens in Mexico. It is the one the Senator from Idaho, I believe, heard me discuss the other day in the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I had the pleasure of listening to the Senator. The suggestion I was going to make is this. I am ready, so far as I am concerned, to shape and dispose of that resolution here upon the floor now.

And, Mr. President, I make this single suggestion, that the resolution had just as well be withdrawn for any good it will

do the American citizens who are being murdered in Mexico day by day, as to send it to the committee. In saying that I do not mean to reflect upon the committee, but this very hour is the time when those people need protection and need decisive action. The Senate ought to take a decided step this morning to notify the Mexican people that so far as the Congress are concerned we are ready to use the armed force of the United States to protect our people. What we need at this time is prompt and decided and unmistakable action.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution going to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. LEWIS. May I be permitted an observation? I will say to the Senator from Idaho—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The whole thing is out of order. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BORAH. I ask, then, that the resolution may go over until we get through with the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being an objection, it is not now in order to move to send it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

After the transaction of further routine business, which appears under its appropriate heading,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to recur to the subject which was under consideration a short time ago, and I move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 at once be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will state that my reason for so doing is because the committee meets to-morrow, and I have reason to believe that they will act promptly upon the resolution, and to-morrow make such disposition of the matter as will comport with the view of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] by giving immediate hearing. For that reason, I move that the resolution be now sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUGHES. Will not the Senator from Illinois withhold that request until morning business is concluded?

Mr. BORAH. May I say a word, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already once ruled upon the question, that until the conclusion of the morning hour, except by unanimous consent, the calendar or anything upon the calendar can not be taken up.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I misunderstood the Chair. As I now understand it, I think the ruling of the Chair is unquestionably in accordance with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing can be taken up during the morning hour, prior to 1 o'clock, except by unanimous consent. That has been the uniform ruling of all presiding officers.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois misunderstood the Chair's application.

After the transaction of further routine business, which appears under its appropriate heading,

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk to be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and instructed to use the Army and Navy of the United States for the protection of American lives and property in Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I notice in the morning papers of to-day an intimation that the President of the United States has—

Mr. STONE. I object. Of course, my motion is an objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LIPPITT. There is a motion before the Senate, and I was going to say a few words upon it.

Mr. STONE. I ask for the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEWIS. Under the rules, if objection were made the resolution would lie over one day, would it not?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

Mr. LEWIS. I rise to a point of order. Under objection it lies over a day, and can not be discussed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If objection is made it goes over a day, but objection has not yet been raised.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope the Senator will not raise that objection hastily, and I should like to say just a word or two in regard to this matter. First, I think it is a very important matter, and I think the situation is such at the present time that the

Senate ought to give immediate consideration to this question. American lives are being lost and American property is being destroyed every day in Mexico, and we ought not to sit here idly without expressing our opinion and considering such a situation as that.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LIPPITT. Not for a moment, Mr. President. I was about to ask the Senator from Missouri a question, if he will allow me.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will permit me to say a word, if the resolution goes over under a mere objection until to-morrow morning and then comes up for consideration the motion which I have made to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations would then be in order. Under that motion, being debatable, the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator could proceed to debate it. So far as I am concerned, I see no reason why the Senator should not express himself, so far as he wishes, this morning as well as to-morrow morning; but I renew the motion which I have made to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to have the resolution read for information.

Mr. LEWIS. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one second.

Mr. STONE. But I have made a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but the Senator from Illinois, as the Chair understands, has objected to the present consideration of the resolution, which will carry it over, together with the motion in connection with it.

Mr. LEWIS. Under that objection it lies over a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It certainly does, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there are some of us who do not know what the resolution is, and we should like to have information concerning that point.

Mr. STONE. I will inquire of the Senator from Illinois what is the object of having it go over until to-morrow morning, when the same situation will be here then that we have now?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if he feels that he would rather not have the objection made to carry the resolution over, and out of deference to him as head of the committee I withdraw my objection.

Mr. STONE. Then let the motion which I have made to refer be the pending motion.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs pardon of Senators; the Chair's attention was distracted. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his objection?

Mr. LEWIS. I withdraw the objection in deference to the views of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the pending motion is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I did not understand what the Chair said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending motion is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Is this a Senate, a concurrent, or a joint resolution?

Mr. LIPPITT. It is a Senate resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator think that the Senate of the United States alone can give the authority to the President which the resolution seeks to give?

Mr. LIPPITT. It can be made a joint resolution. I am not particular about the exact form in which it is done. It is the substance of the matter which concerns me.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me my suggestion is a very substantial one.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, in the press this morning I saw a statement that the President of the United States has made an agreement with certain Republics of South America under which it is impossible for him to take any action in Mexico without their consent. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri, who is in special touch with the administration on account of his position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body, if he has any idea how long it is going to take for the United States to get the permission of Peru, Guatemala, and Argentina to protect the lives of its own

citizens and the property of its own citizens in Mexico? I presume that some arrangement of the kind has been made, and before I proceed further to the discussion of the resolution which I have offered I should like to know if the Senator can give us any information as to how long it is going to be before this great American Republic will be allowed to act in the protection of its own people.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the question the Senator propounds is so puerile and inconsequential that it scarcely deserves an answer. To ask whether the Government of the United States is bound to consult any other Government in the world as to what it may or may not do, I repeat, is so—I wish I could find just the word; I wish to be parliamentary—so far beneath the dignity of a Senator of the United States that I decline to answer. It is a question based, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], on some newspaper report.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator from Missouri characterize this statement in the very strong language which he has used. I would not have referred to it at this time, coming from the source it does, as the Senator says—a mere newspaper declaration—if it were not for the fact that for more than two years negotiations have been carried on with various parties in Mexico without any information being given to this body as to their intention or their character.

There has been recently passed by this body a request for full information in regard to the Mexican situation. It is information that, in my opinion, ought to have been given to this body long since, and without any special request. That request, however, unanimously passed by this body, has now been in the hands of the President for nearly two weeks without any response as yet being made to it, without any statement that there is going to be any response made to it; and I, for one, am in the dark as to what the situation is in regard to Mexican matters. As is the case with every other Senator in this body, I have been obliged to rely upon newspaper reports for information as to what is going on in connection with Mexico. The information which I now have, reading from the Washington Post, is that—

Congress will be fully informed of the agreement entered into between the United States and the Republics of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Guatemala.

The chief provision of this agreement is that any step taken by the United States of a more aggressive character will be at the instigation of the Central and South American countries. The President and Secretary Lansing have in effect pledged this country to be guided by the views of their associates in the undertaking.

The Senator from Missouri may characterize that as puerile. He may say it is impossible that such an agreement can be made, and I sincerely hope it is impossible; but until we have information from some higher source I am obliged to rely upon reports of this character. Therefore I do not think it was improper for me to ask the Senator from Missouri about the accuracy of such a report as that, which is of such vital importance at this time, when American lives are being destroyed.

The Senator from Missouri also, in a few remarks which he made here last week, asked the Senators on this side of the Chamber to be fair, because he said there would be other American lives lost, and that we had to expect that incidents such as occurred last week, the destruction of the lives of 18 Americans, would be repeated. It seems to me, in the light of such a declaration as that and in the light of such a declaration as this in the paper, that it is not improper that information should be asked about it.

On August 27, 1913, in discussing the Mexican situation, the President of the United States used this language:

We should let everyone who assumes to exercise authority in any part of Mexico know in the most unequivocal way that we shall vigilantly watch the fortunes of those Americans who can not get away, and shall hold those responsible for their sufferings and losses to a definite reckoning. That can be and will be made plain beyond the possibility of a misunderstanding.

Sir, the doctrine of "I can" is one that is very congenial to the spirit of the American people. The American people have been a people of accomplishment. They have been in the habit of doing things; and when anybody makes that declaration, it meets a very responsive note in the heart of every American citizen. Hand in hand with that doctrine goes the statement "I will," for America expects that its citizens will do what they can do. So, sir, the doctrine of "I can" and "I will" is one that epitomizes the spirit of the American people for more than 250 years. If that statement and that doctrine had been carried out in connection with this Mexican matter, I think, sir, we would not have been in our present situation.

Unfortunately, however, the President of the United States has also made another declaration in connection with Mexican matters. At Indianapolis, about a year ago, he made the re-

markable statement that "it was the right of the Mexicans to spill as much blood as they pleased and as long as they pleased."

Sir, with that cruel and brutal and pusillanimous doctrine I have no sympathy. There are different kinds of blood. There is Mexican blood, and with that we have no particular concern in this body; but there is also American blood, and with the spilling of that we have great duties and responsibilities. Those duties and responsibilities can not be evaded until such time as their consideration will be of no effect if we are to act as we ought to in such circumstances.

Further than that, the administration has been very solicitous about the foreign trade of this country. It has been urging American citizens to engage in it. The President, in his tariff message, said that we must encourage trade, especially foreign trade. Now, sir, foreign trade means foreign complications. If a man sends his merchandise to the other countries of the world, it means that he must sometimes go there himself to watch over it and guard it. We are now confronted with the situation that the President of the United States, and recently the Secretary of State, have said that all of our people in Mexico should be compelled to leave that country and to abandon their property.

Sir, we can not be a great trading Nation in the foreign countries of the world if in time of trouble we are going to say to our people that their property there will not be protected. If we encourage our people to engage in foreign commerce, it is our manifest duty to protect them in the difficulties that may arise in connection with such transactions.

The Senator from Missouri a day or two ago asked one or two Senators on this floor what they would do in connection with the Mexican matter, and they gave such answers as seemed to them suitable. In view of the considerations I have stated I will say for myself, in answer to the question of what I would do, that if I had been President of the United States last week, when the report of these Mexican murders arrived in Washington, and had been Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, another sun would not have set over the Sierra Madre Mountains before American soldiers would be hot on the trail of those murderers. The first scrap of paper that I would have used in connection with that affair would have been a telegram instructing those soldiers to use every possible effort to secure those murderers, dead or alive; and I would have had in it a strong intimation that they need not object to including in those provisions some of their accomplices and sympathizers. And, sir, I would have kept up that policy until the life of every American ranchman in Mexico was as safe as though he had been in the streets of Washington, until every head of cattle upon his ranch was as safe from robbers and bandits as the children in his house.

Such a doctrine as that, I believe, will meet a responsive note to-day in the hearts of the American people. It is not war on Mexico or her people. It is maintaining order and protecting Americans. Sir, the time has come when we can not sit idly by and see our people murdered and their property lost on the excuse that we are not capable of effective action.

It is with those feelings, sir, that I have introduced this resolution, and I hope it may have the action of the Senate.

Mr. STONE obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, before the Senator begins, will he yield to me to offer a simple resolution on another subject? It is a matter of importance.

Mr. STONE. Does it relate to international affairs?

Mr. MYERS. No; it relates to another subject entirely. It is a routine matter.

Mr. STONE. Can not the Senator withhold it? Is it very urgent at this particular moment?

Mr. MYERS. Well, no; but I should like to offer it at some time before 2 o'clock. I will wait, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be a violation of the rule. The Chair is going to assume the responsibility from now on, until the Chair changes his mind, of enforcing the rule of the Senate that no Senator shall be interrupted for the purpose of making a report or introducing a bill or memorial or any other document. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate for only a brief while. It may be that you could find a Senator, possibly two or three, on the other side who may be really anxious for war with Mexico and who would like forthwith to unleash the dogs of war; I am not sure as to that, but I seriously doubt whether there is a genuine sentiment among the level-headed and sensible, the conservative and patriotic Senators on that side for any proceeding of that kind. I hardly believe, Mr. President, that if that sentiment represented the consensus of opinion on that side the Senators over there would select their most indiscreet, intemperate, and im-

pulsive associates instead of their more level-headed men to give expression to their attitude. I can not but think that these wild ones speak only for themselves.

Mr. President, I do not believe that Senators on that side are really desirous of war or that they have an impatient thirst or appetite to lick their tongues in Mexican gore. I do not believe that. On the contrary, I think that a declaration of war by the Congress would be the last thing the sensible men on that side would desire. It would be the last thing any sensible man would desire, but they above all others. A declaration of war would break their hearts. There are a few Senators on that side who for party reasons, as they see it, talk about war because seemingly some of them have not anything else to talk about, and because they think they must make fuss and feathers and create what may at least approach a sensation. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] suggests sotto voce that all of them are past military age. Still, a man may be beyond military age and his capacity for voluble exploitation remain unimpaired, or, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggests aside to me, that such a man in other ways may be just as valuable as ever, whatever that may mean.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island, who is striving in these grave emergencies to leap into the leadership of his party, in an apparent effort to force it into an attitude of desiring and insisting upon war, refers to something I said a few days ago about the possibility—aye, the probability—of a repetition in some place or in one way or another of the murderous incident that occurred at San Ysabel some days ago. As to that, I wish to say that, however regrettable it would be if such incidents should in future occur, it would probably be due to foolhardiness and adventure on the part of those who suffer, whether Americans or the nationals of other countries. If knowingly and deliberately men go into a nest of bandits, or go among wild Indians, who have a wholly different code of morals and ethics from ours; if they deliberately go right into such dangers, they are apt to get into trouble. It has not been very long ago since men took their lives in their hands when they went out among the Apaches or Comanches on our own plains and in our own mountains; and they knew it when they went, and they took the hazard like men. Men do those things. They have done it all through history here and there. It may have been, and still may be, foolhardy, but men do such things. More than that, I will say at this juncture that I think it is a foolhardy thing for men or women to go aboard a ship and ride recklessly into a zone of danger, where they know that behind every wave lifting the ship death is lurking. But they do it. This Government no doubt is under some measure of obligation to do what it can to protect even the people who do these foolish things, but that does not lessen the foolishness of the act. When men do things of this kind their recklessness is in a way a crime against the American Government they look to for protection, since it tends to involve the Government and our people in most dangerous controversies.

No doubt men will do these things in the future as they have done them in the past, and if they do them the same old result will probably follow. If Americans or other foreigners go into a nest of Villa bandits, who openly declare their bloody purposes, we know they take their lives in their hands; or if they go out into the Sierra Madre Mountains, among the Yaqui Indians, we also know that they take their lives in their hands. But I have not any doubt that men will continue to do just such things. Even in the very incipency of the Carranza de facto government, before a half-fair opportunity has been given that government to restore and maintain order in that country, I suppose such people as I speak of will continue to do such foolish things as I deprecate. Hence I have said that such bloody and regrettable incidents as the one recorded a few days ago are likely to occur again.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] said that if he had been President, immediately upon receiving word that 18 American citizens had been killed, he would have directed our military forces along the Mexican border to invade Mexico to pursue the bandit murderers—and as my friend from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] says, on the side, without even consulting Congress. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island does not know, but he should know, that the President of the United States is without constitutional authority to order our Army to invade Mexico for such purpose as he outlines—that is, to follow these bandits into the heart of Mexico and pursue them over the country for an indefinite period.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. That would be war, and the President—

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for one minute?

Mr. STONE. I will.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if the President of the United States did not, without any authority other than that which he now has, land marines in Vera Cruz?

Mr. STONE. The President came to Congress with respect to that subject, and Congress authorized him to take that action.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me one minute—

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Is it not true that in the middle of the night, while Congress was discussing the question whether they would or would not authorize that action, word was received in this Chamber that marines had been landed in Vera Cruz by order of the President of the United States? It is within the memory of every man in this Chamber who was here at that time that the President took that action without any authority other than he now has at this minute. It would seem to me that if he had the authority to land marines he has authority to send American troops over the border.

If the Senator will excuse me, I am not for a minute talking about war with Mexico in this resolution.

Mr. STONE. Then what is the Senator talking about?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am talking about defending American lives and property, which is quite another proposition.

Mr. STONE. But the Senator has been talking about war. He said he thought the President ought to have ordered the American Army to invade Mexico and that if he had been President he would have done that very thing.

Mr. President, whatever may have been done at any time by anybody, without stopping to discuss the incidents of a particular event, and without stopping to criticize or justify any particular event, I undertake to say that the President of the United States has no constitutional right to order an invasion of Mexico in the circumstances we have before us. He would subject himself to impeachment if he should do so. If American citizens should be killed in southern Mexico by the Zapata band, would any Senator contend that, without consulting the Congress, the President, on his own motion could constitutionally order 20,000 or 100,000 or more men to invade and overrun the whole Republic of Mexico? If that be true, then the constitutional power vested in Congress to declare war is a meaningless thing.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not before me at present the message which the President sent to Congress at the time he asked us to justify his intervention with the Army and Navy in Mexico, but it is my strong recollection that the President stated in his message that while he himself entertained no doubt whatever of his constitutional authority to use the Army and the Navy in Mexico, still the consequence of its use would probably be so grave that he hesitated to do it without securing the consent of Congress. As I said, I have not the message before me.

Mr. STONE. Nor have I.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But I think I recollect that very clearly.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, who is a lawyer of ability and eminence, whether he believes that the President, without consulting Congress, in the case before us, where American citizens were murdered 100 or 150 miles south of our border in Chihuahua, could have ordered the American Army to invade Mexico, as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island? Does the Senator believe that?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator couples his question with a good many conditions.

Mr. STONE. Well, without conditions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would have to be allowed to answer in my own way, if I were to answer at all, because it depends, in my opinion, entirely upon the extent to which it is done. I think, of course, it goes without saying that the President has no authority to make war against a foreign nation without the consent of Congress. It is exclusively in the control of Congress to declare war and to make peace. But it has been repeatedly held, and the Senator will so find—he knows it himself without my telling him so—that a mere intrusion to rescue citizens or to protect the property of citizens is not an act of war, and the President has repeatedly and unquestionably exercised such authority by the landing of marines and then retiring after the object has been accomplished. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. STONE. That has been done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. When the Senator asks if they can go 100 or 150 miles, and so forth, there the Senator is entering upon another field, and I am not prepared to answer him.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has, acting, I think, within his authority, in some instances intervened where the lives of American citizens were imperiled, and even on occasions naval officers of the United States, acting largely on their own authority, have intervened to protect the imperiled lives of American citizens, and their course was sustained by the Government. That is one thing, but a different thing from the case wherein the Senator from Rhode Island declares that he, if President, would have ordered the Army into Mexico to run down rioters or bandits who had killed American citizens, and to pursue them as he pleased anywhere over that Republic. To do that would unquestionably have brought our Army into conflict with the Army of the Mexican government. It would have done that with any government anywhere in the world that might have dared to resist such an invasion. Such an invasion would have been war pure and simple.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. STONE. The present President of the United States would not do such a thing as that. I was about to say no President would do that, but perhaps that statement would require modification.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. STONE. It may be possible that we have had, or might yet have, a President who would do that—a President who would recognize no restraint upon himself. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, he certainly can recognize the fact that the President of the United States, as has been brought out here upon the floor within the last few minutes, did invade Mexico with the armed men of the United States for the purpose of preventing a cargo of ammunition from being landed there from Germany. This is a question of the deepest importance. It involves the lives of American citizens.

I see no reason why such action as I have described in the present disordered state of Mexico might not be done with the full authority and permission of the so-called government of Mexico. I presume and hope that when we receive information about the Mexican situation it will be found that the President of the United States has not entered into a partnership with Mr. Carranza without having some agreement and understanding with him about what shall happen there, what rights the American Government shall have there, in case Mr. Carranza himself is not able to establish order.

But the proposition that I have made is far from war. It goes no further than to announce to the Mexican people and to all the world that the United States proposes, to the ultimate limit of its ability, to protect the lives and the property of its people wherever they are; and if there is any question of authority now, the purpose of the resolution is to remove that doubt by distinctly authorizing the President to do these things.

Mr. STONE. If the resolution merely means what the Senator says it means, that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States will protect American citizens throughout the world, then it is a useless resolution. It states what everybody subscribes to.

I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, we are on the eve of a presidential campaign. It has been the custom of each party to present its indictment against the party in power during the session immediately preceding such a campaign. During such session it has been the custom to engage in crimination and recrimination, and to exhaust the time in partisan attacks rather than to spend it usefully in correctional or constructive legislation.

This has been the custom of both parties. I do not present a charge against the Republican Party to-day that could not have been made with equal correctness against my own party in past times.

I deplore, however, that the fact that in a crisis of this kind, when the President of the United States is engaged in negotiations that relate to two wars—a civil war on our borders in Mexico and an international war abroad—and when the questions of the highest delicacy are being considered by the man charged by the Constitution with responsibility regarding the conduct of our foreign relations, we should allow a question of our foreign relations to enter into these controversies of crimination and recrimination.

Just before the Cuban war I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. At that time the country was excited with reference to the condition of Cuba. An election was approach-

ing and the party of which I was a member was then engaged in somewhat the same form of attack upon Mr. McKinley as is now being indulged in by the Republican Party upon Mr. Wilson. I recall that during that time the President was embarrassed by the consideration of numerous resolutions presented by the leaders of the adversary party in the House of Representatives regarding the recognition of belligerent rights and other matters of that kind. I recall that at a conference of the Democrats of the House the question came up as to whether this mode of attack was proper and would be fruitful of results. I ventured to inquire at that time whether the Democratic Party wished to get into war, and I was assured it did not; that it was a mere question of party tactics; that the commencement and the maintenance of a war pending a national campaign would insure the retention in power of the dominant party. My reply was, then this resolution will drive this administration into war. An answer came back from a prominent Democrat that the Republican Party could not be kicked into war. That mode of attack went on. Disaffection increased in the Republican Party; in the Northwest, particularly, the sentiment was intense and Republicans felt that their seats were in danger at the approaching election. They formed an organization called the "Insurgents," and called upon the President with reference to the pending situation and insisted that the administration should take decisive action.

Finding himself gradually losing the support of his own party in his deliberate methods, the President finally announced that he would deliver a message to Congress upon the Cuban situation on a particular day, the following Friday. The House of Representatives met in expectancy of that message. Business was suspended; the atmosphere was surcharged with electricity. Contention arose on the floor in one or two cases leading almost to physical violence while they were awaiting the presidential message. Whilst I stood there philosophically viewing the scene and wondering at the turbulence of a so-called deliberative body the Sergeant at Arms informed me that the President desired to see me at the White House. I went there and in the ante-room found two other Democrats, minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We were immediately ushered into the President's office. He sat there at a table upon which lay a document bound in red ribbon, evidently the message which he was about to send to Congress. I could not but contrast the calm and the dignity of that room and of the President himself with the scene of turbulence which I had just left. The President informed us that he had just received a telegram from Consul General Lee at Habana advising him that Habana was in a high state of excitement with reference to his anticipated message; that there were 500 Americans in Habana whom he wished to send back to this country before that message was announced and asking him to postpone its delivery.

Mr. McKinley stated that the country expected this message upon that day and that Congress expected it; that he could not announce to the country the cause of postponement, for if the telegram were published it might produce in Habana the same effect that might be produced by the presidential message. He said that he had, therefore, called us as members of the minority and adversary party to ask our judgment regarding the situation. We told him that we thought the message ought to be postponed. He replied that he thought so, too; that he would rather lose his right arm, as he expressed it, than run the risk of losing a single American life, but that he was unable to make any public statement regarding the matter, and he requested us to pass around, without publicity, among our associates on the floor of the House and state that the President of the United States had taken us into his confidence and had presented to us good reasons for the postponement of the message. We assured him that we would do so, and we thought the undertaking an easy one, but when we arrived at the House we found the turbulence of that body increased, not diminished. Word had been passed around that we had been sent for and the purpose was suspected. The result was a flood of denunciation, particularly from the so-called "insurgent members" of the Republican Party, some of whom in my hearing, upon our return to that body, when we were passing around in a rather ineffective way stating the result of our communication with Mr. McKinley, denounced him as a man without a backbone or with a rubber backbone. I have often since then thought of that contrast between the quiet and the calm of the President and the excitement of a so-called deliberative and representative body.

Mr. President, Mr. McKinley was driven into that war both by the adversary party and by the insurgents in his own party. He was always confident that he could have secured the freedom of Cuba without war, but the war sentiment of the country was so aroused that he found it impossible to resist it. What was the result? A war which cost the American people thou-

sands of lives and \$600,000,000 in treasure, which put into our possession as the result of the spirit of conquest aroused by that war 3,000 isles 7,000 miles away from our base, involving an annual military expense since that time for their defense of at least \$25,000,000, nearly \$600,000,000 more up to the present time, and we are now seeking methods of withdrawing from those islands to whose abandonment we have become reconciled, not so much as a matter of altruism as because the retention of the islands does not pay.

During the period of that war we neglected our domestic affairs, and whilst we were conquering other countries the trusts conquered our own, and we have been 10 years in freeing ourselves from the subjection which they imposed upon the American people whilst our attention was diverted in other directions.

It will be easy for this country to get into war with Mexico; it will be easy for this country to get into the European war if the war spirit of the country is aroused; and the war spirit of the country will be aroused if the leading men of the Nation constantly add fuel to the flames. So I appeal to members of the adversary party not to push these conditions of war into this political campaign. You may in search of a partisan advantage push the country too far. If you do, and we get into war, the country will stand by the existing administration and you will imperil your chances of party success at the next election, and beyond that you will open a Pandora's box of trouble for the United States for the next 20 years.

Mr. President, I have no very harsh judgment regarding these matters. It is a very natural instinct to prod the adversary party; it is an instinct that exists in both parties; it is an instinct which has dominated both parties in the past and will in the future, but I do beg of the Members of this body, the highest deliberative body in the world, a body that ought to move with deliberation, caution, and judgment, not to lend itself to the kindling of a flame that may mean universal conflagration; and I appeal to them to let these matters rest with the executive department of the Government, charged with responsibility under the Constitution, without undue criticism, without making the way of the President of the United States hard and difficult, reserving until his task is complete that judgment which the American people will always pronounce upon either success or failure.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I believe this resolution, together with the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and all other resolutions upon this subject, should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that committee should be given a reasonable time to consider these resolutions, and I think within a reasonable time it ought to make a report.

I intend only to take a minute or two of the time of the Senate, and in that time I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a message or telegram I received from a leading Democrat in the State of Kansas on the 15th of December, which I that day brought to the attention of the State Department. The sender of this message says he does not care for publicity. He predicted what would happen, just as it did happen, and a few days later I asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations this question:

Does not the Senator think that if the State Department would refuse to permit Mexican troops to cross the territory of the United States in going from one part of Mexico to another, and if the State Department would prevent Mexican generals representing the Carranza government from having headquarters in the United States, perhaps some of this trouble would be stopped?

To that the chairman of the committee replied:

Mr. President, that may be or may not be true; I do not know. The Senator's question implies a criticism of the act allowing Carranza troops to pass through our territory. I do not wish to be diverted into that kind of a discussion.

It was not my intention to criticize, but it was my intention to point out, if I could, an error that the department has made. To show that it had full information, and in order that this committee may fully consider this question, I am going to now, with the permission of the sender of this telegram, to ask the Secretary to read it for me.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., December 15, 1915.

HON. CHARLES CURTIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

By private code my advices from Mexico for two days by wire from sources I consider absolutely reliable is to the effect that the continued permission of our State Department for Carranza to transport his troops over American territory and American railroads to where he needed them most to fight Gen. Villa has so infuriated the Mexican people of the interior, a large majority of whom are opposed to Carranza, that there is very great danger. I think it probable that there

will be a massacre of Americans not in the north alone, but probably in all Mexico, of whom there are hundreds in the north and thousands in the whole country yet and to a great extent unable to get out.

I myself saw the 5,000 Carranza troops go through El Paso from Laredo to Douglas, October 31, and saw the battle of Agua Prieta a day or two later, and met Gen. Villa at Naco, after the battle, and talked with him at length. I see that they have shifted Carranza troops over American territory back and forth from Nogales to Agua Prieta by permission of the State Department, and right now they are starting a Carranza troop movement eastward over American territory and American railroads to border points several hundred miles east, probably opposite Ojinaga. While the recognition of Carranza was a colossal blunder, our right to do so probably could not be questioned nor our right to place an embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition, provided we applied it to both Carranza's and Villa's armies; but when we apply the embargo to Villa only, and allow Carranza to transport his troops over our territory, conveyed by American soldiers, and otherwise aid and assist Carranza, why is not our action an act of war, and are we not an ally of Carranza? We have gone beyond recognition. We are an active ally, and our action, if in Europe, would bring a declaration of war in 24 hours.

Is it the desire of our administration to precipitate a war with Mexico and her 16,000,000 people? If so, we can readily understand our participation. I was told in Mexico a year ago that if we made war on Mexico we would have not Mexico alone to whip. You can readily understand that this transporting of Carranza troops over our territory is infuriating the masses in Mexico; they are a quick-tempered, hot-blooded people, and regard the action of our Government in aiding Carranza as an effort to saddle a president on them by a foreign power, and they hate and resent foreign interference in their internal affairs.

If the transportation of Carranza troops over American territory is not stopped at once and immediately by the President and Secretary Lansing I sincerely believe that these justly infuriated people will retaliate in a frightful way; and if they do, the blood of several hundred, perhaps a thousand, murdered Americans will be on the heads of Wilson and Lansing on account of their ill-advised and reckless action. Is Carranza or the desire to aid him more important than the lives of innumerable Americans? My information is that the feeling is so great that Villa will not be able to control his people, or, to use their words, "He will not be able to hold them down." It is possible that if these troop trains now loading were stopped at once and where they are and further transportation over American territory denied, and those en route returned, that a possible massacre can be avoided, but if these troops are transported as now arranged the President and Secretary Lansing will have to answer and be responsible for such consequences as result. Our troops can not save our helpless people in the interior of Mexico from the consequences of ill-advised and impractical action at Washington. Carranza is impossible, and stands no more show of being President of Mexico than the man in the moon.

Will you be so kind as to read this message from your Democratic friend and constituent at once to Secretary Lansing and to the President, if he will condescend to hear it, because if the worst comes the odium will fall on them. I would greatly prefer that no publicity be given this communication at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. Who signs it?

Mr. CURTIS. I will ask the Secretary to read the name.

The Secretary read as follows:

Signed, Frank S. Thomas.

Mr. STONE. Ah! Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir; for a question. I want to finish my remarks.

Mr. STONE. The Senator knows Mr. Thomas?

Mr. CURTIS. I have known Mr. Thomas all his life.

Mr. STONE. I know Mr. Thomas also. I have known him a number of years. Within the last two years he has come to see me at Washington and other places to confer with me. I heard what he had to say. He came to me as the agent and employee of Gen. Villa, working for Villa, in a sense his representative to this country to confer with American officials in the Villa interest. What there was in it for him I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. If my friend will pardon me further—

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. This telegram—which I assume the Senator indorses, or else he would not have presented it—complains that this Government permits Carranza soldiers to pass over American territory in pursuit of bandits, or of those opposing the government there, while other Senators arise here and insist that we should ourselves throw our troops into Mexico because the Carranza forces can not suppress outlawry. One objects to our allowing Mexican troops to pass even across the borders of our country in pursuit of criminals, while another Senator on that side urges us to send in our own troops.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. STONE. I am through.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to state that I did not have this telegram read with a view of criticizing. I had it read so that the Senate might know, and so that the Senate committee might consider, the objections that were being raised by members of the majority party and the errors that were being pointed out by the members of their own party. Before I conclude my remarks I want to ask to have printed an editorial from the El Paso Times of December 17 or 18 on the same subject, criticizing the action of permitting Mexican troops to be taken across our territory in going from one point in Mexico to another; and that is a question that the committee should con-

sider. If the taking of Carranza troops over the territory of the United States has caused the death of American citizens, then the order permitting such action should be revoked.

I am not here to say that I am for war. I want the Committee on Foreign Relations to take what action is necessary to protect the lives and the property of American citizens in Mexico; and, so far as I am concerned, I would want them to take every step necessary to avoid war as long as it can be avoided with honor. But it is the duty of this Government to protect the lives of American citizens; and if, by permitting Mexican troops to come across our border, they are endangering the lives of American citizens, then they should stop it.

Mr. President, another thing. The Senator from Missouri criticized and said that these Americans who crossed the border the other day had committed a crime. Far from it. If the newspapers are to be believed, those men went across the border with the assurance of protection; and it was said in the newspapers that a troop of Carranza's men had been taken in a train ahead of them. If so, why were they not given protection by Carranza?

In old times it was said, and it ought to be said now, that an American citizen's protection was in the Stars and Stripes; but that can not be said of the last two years in Mexico. Not only according to newspaper reports, but according to information that comes from Americans who were there, at Tampico American citizens had to depend for protection upon a foreign flag, and our ships sailed away and left them helpless and at the mercy of the men who were shooting them down.

A few weeks ago there came to my office a citizen of Oklahoma, who was in Tampico at that time, and he told me it was shameful the way American citizens were left there, and that if it had not been for a German officer he does not know how many of them would have been killed at Tampico.

I want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I will join with him and the other Senators in this body in passing a resolution that will protect the lives of American citizens, but there should not be too much delay. Let us give consideration to every side of this question. I do not know whether Frank Thomas represents Villa or not. I have known him since he was a boy. He is an insurance agent and a money loaner in the city of Topeka. But even if he is Villa's representative, would it not be better for this administration to send a man like Frank Thomas to consult with Villa, rather than to send down there some man who wants to give them only the information they want, and not give them the truth?

I venture to say that if the President of the United States would send for Frank S. Thomas and consult with him Frank Thomas would tell him the truth about the situation; and I think the difficulty has been that this Government has not been given the truth about the situation in Mexico.

I ask that the editorial from the El Paso paper to which I have referred may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial from the El Paso Morning Times.]

ANOTHER NUISANCE HEREABOUTS.

More Carranzista troops are to be transported through the United States. This time we learn that a portion of Obregon's army is to be transferred from Agua Prieta, Sonora, to Ojinaga, Chihuahua. These ragged ruffians will necessarily have to pass through El Paso. They will probably be delayed here several hours, as they were while en route to Agua Prieta from Mexican border towns to the east of El Paso. There are thousands and thousands of Mexicans in El Paso, and while these Carranza troops are here much uneasiness is felt by El Pasoans. It is true that these Mexican soldiers are guarded by American troops while here, but there is ever the possibility of an outbreak among the Mexicans opposed to the newly recognized de facto government of Mexico. Unless we are mistaken—and we don't think we are—the majority of El Paso's present Mexican population is antagonistic to the Carranzistas. At any rate, the appearance here of these Carranzista troops is not calculated to encourage peace and quiet among the Mexicans, for the Mexicans who are opposed to the cause of the Carranzistas deeply resent the action of the American Government in granting permission to them for the transportation of the troops through American territory.

As a matter of fact, the Carranzistas are already abusing the privilege of moving their troops through American territory, and the Morning Times for one is going to protest against the American Government granting any further permits for troop transportation through American territory to the de facto government in Mexico. Absolutely nothing was accomplished by the original movement of troops to Agua Prieta. The Villistas really made only a half-hearted attack on that town, and the troops which were already there could as easily have defended it. And Obregon, instead of mustering his army and going out in the open in pursuit of the Villistas, commenced transferring his troops back and forth from one Sonora border town to another through the United States, while he hung around the border. He was out-generated at every turn, the Villistas having either accomplished their purpose in invading Sonora or, having failed to accomplish it, returned to Chihuahua. But the opportunity of the Carranzistas to engage them in a decisive battle was not taken advantage of, and as a consequence the situation in northern Mexico is as bad, if not worse, than

before the first consignment of Carranzista troops were permitted to pass through American territory.

Now, Obregon proposes transferring his troops to Ojinaga. And when he finds that he can accomplish nothing by occupying that town he will perhaps seek permission to transfer them to some other border town, the passage, of course, to be made through the United States. Where will it end? Nobody knows. We do know, however, that these frequent excursions through American territory are becoming a nuisance, to say nothing of their menace to the peace and quiet of the American borderland. The sooner the practice is discontinued, through the refusal of the American Government to grant permission for these transfers of troops through American territory, the better it will be.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a minute on the matter to which I called the attention of the Senator from Missouri, in relation to the question whether the President had authority, without consulting Congress, to order the Army and Navy into a foreign country.

I read from the President's message of April 20, 1914. He had been discussing the question of sending the Army and Navy into Mexico to exact amends from Mr. Huerta. He says:

No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our Government without recourse to the Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President, but I do not wish to act in a matter possibly of so grave consequence except in close conference and cooperation with both the Senate and House. I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the armed forces of the United States in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain from Gen. Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States, even amidst the distressing conditions now unhappily obtaining in Mexico.

So that whatever may be the fact about the right of the President to do that, there is no doubt that the President thought he had the right at that time, and so stated to Congress.

In order that there may be no misconception about the matter, and that I may not be thought by anybody to be taking a particular paragraph from the context or distorting its meaning, I will ask that the entire message, which is only two or three short pages, be printed in the Record in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Gentlemen of the Congress, it is my duty to call your attention to a situation which has arisen in our dealings with Gen. Victoriano Huerta at Mexico City which calls for action, and to ask your advice and cooperation in acting upon it. On the 9th of April a paymaster of the U. S. S. *Dolphin* landed at the Iturbide Bridge landing at Tampico with a whaleboat and boat's crew to take off certain supplies needed by his ship, and while engaged in loading the boat was arrested by an officer and squad of men of the army of Gen. Huerta. Neither the paymaster nor anyone of the boat's crew was armed. Two of the men were in the boat when the arrest took place, and were obliged to leave it and submit to be taken into custody, notwithstanding the fact that the boat carried, both at her bow and at her stern, the flag of the United States. The officer who made the arrest was proceeding up one of the streets of the town with his prisoners when met by an officer of higher authority, who ordered him to return to the landing and await orders; and within an hour and a half from the time of the arrest orders were received from the commander of the Huertista forces at Tampico for the release of the paymaster and his men. The release was followed by apologies from the commander and later by an expression of regret by Gen. Huerta himself. Gen. Huerta urged that martial law obtained at the time at Tampico; that orders had been issued that no one should be allowed to land at the Iturbide Bridge; and that our sailors had no right to land there. Our naval commanders at the port had not been notified of any such prohibition; and, even if they had been, the only justifiable course open to the local authorities would have been to request the paymaster and his crew to withdraw and to lodge a protest with the commanding officer of the fleet. Admiral Mayo regarded the arrest as so serious an affront that he was not satisfied with the apologies offered, but demanded that the flag of the United States be saluted with special ceremony by the military commander of the port.

The incident can not be regarded as a trivial one, especially as two of the men arrested were taken from the boat itself—that is to say, from the territory of the United States—but had it stood by itself it might have been attributed to the ignorance or arrogance of a single officer. Unfortunately, it was not an isolated case. A series of incidents have recently occurred which can not but create the impression that the representatives of Gen. Huerta were willing to go out of their way to show disregard for the dignity and rights of this Government and felt perfectly safe in doing what they pleased, making free to show in many ways their irritation and contempt. A few days after the incident at Tampico an orderly from the U. S. S. *Minnesota* was arrested at Vera Cruz while ashore in uniform to obtain the ship's mail and was for a time thrown into jail. An official dispatch from this Government to its embassy at Mexico City was withheld by the authorities of the telegraphic service until peremptorily demanded by our chargé d'affaires in person. So far as I can learn, such wrongs and annoyances have been suffered to occur only against representatives of the United States. I have heard of no complaints from other Governments of similar treatment. Subsequent explanations and formal apologies did not and could not alter the popular impression, which it is possible it had been the object of the Huertista authorities to create, that the Government of the United States was being singled out, and might be singled out with impunity, for slights and affronts in retaliation for its refusal to recognize the pretensions of Gen. Huerta to be regarded as the constitutional provisional President of the Republic of Mexico.

The manifest danger of such a situation was that such offenses might grow from bad to worse, until something happened of so gross and intolerable a sort as to lead directly and inevitably to armed conflict. It was necessary that the apologies of Gen. Huerta and his representatives should go much further; that they should be such as to attract the attention of the whole population to their significance and such as

to impress upon Gen. Huerta himself the necessity of seeing to it that no further occasion for explanations and professed regrets should arise. I therefore felt it my duty to sustain Admiral Mayo in the whole of his demand and to insist that the flag of the United States should be saluted in such a way as to indicate a new spirit and attitude on the part of the Huertistas.

Such a salute Gen. Huerta has refused, and I have come to ask your approval and support in the course I now purpose to pursue.

This Government can, I earnestly hope, in no circumstances be forced into war with the people of Mexico. Mexico is torn by civil strife. If we are to accept the tests of its own constitution, it has no government. Gen. Huerta has set his power up in the City of Mexico, such as it is, without right and by methods for which there can be no justification. Only part of the country is under his control. If armed conflict should unhappily come as a result of his attitude of personal resentment toward this Government, we should be fighting only Gen. Huerta and those who adhere to him and give him their support, and our object would be only to restore to the people of the distracted Republic the opportunity to set up again their own laws and their own Government.

But I earnestly hope that war is not now in question. I believe that I speak for the American people when I say that we do not desire to control in any degree the affairs of our sister Republic. Our feeling for the people of Mexico is one of deep and genuine friendship, and everything that we have so far done or refrained from doing has proceeded from our desire to help them, not to hinder or embarrass them. We would not wish even to exercise the good offices of friendship without their welcome and consent. The people of Mexico are entitled to settle their own domestic affairs in their own way, and we sincerely desire to respect their right. The present situation need have none of the grave implications of interference if we deal with it promptly, firmly, and wisely.

No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our Government without recourse to the Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President, but I do not wish to act in a matter possibly of so grave consequence except in close conference and cooperation with both the Senate and House. I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the armed forces of the United States in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain from Gen. Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States, even amidst the distressing conditions now unhappily obtaining in Mexico.

There can in what we do be no thought of aggression or of selfish aggrandizement. We seek to maintain the dignity and authority of the United States only because we wish always to keep our great influence unimpaired for the uses of liberty, both in the United States and wherever else it may be employed for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator whether the resolution passed in pursuance of that message giving the President authority to obtain a salute from Huerta was actually passed before or after the Americans were landed at Vera Cruz and engaged in that battle?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My strong impression is that when the resolution which was finally passed in response to the President's message, and which was a substitute for a resolution that had already been adopted by the House, was being considered by the Senate at an evening session the marines had already been landed from the ships which the President had sent to Vera Cruz, and several of our men had lost their lives in the street fight which ensued.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. There is no question whatever about that. It had not occurred when the resolution passed the House; but the morning when the substitute resolution passed the Senate our marines were on the streets of Vera Cruz, actually engaged in the struggle, and being killed. I think at that moment nine had already been killed. There is no question but that when we passed the resolution we were engaged in actual combat in Mexico.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. If the floor is yielded by the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to inform the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that I now renew my motion, and move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9, submitted by myself, be now referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is a resolution now before the Senate, and the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to refer my resolution to the committee.

Mr. STONE. The motion I made was the same the Senator from Illinois had previously made, but which was afterwards lost in the shuffle, as mine seems to have been.

Mr. LEWIS. If I may be pardoned, my motion related to my own resolution and the motion of the Senator from Missouri, as I understood it, related to the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island. Am I correct?

Mr. STONE. Yes; my resolution related to the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. As there seems to be some confusion about it, I request that my resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Illinois yield, if at all?

Mr. LEWIS. I had the floor.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. STONE. The Senator can not make the motion. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order will be stated.

Mr. STONE. My motion to refer the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island to the Committee on Foreign Relations is the pending question, and upon that this debate has been proceeding. I thought the Senator from Illinois had reference to the same matter. The point of order is that until the motion that I made is disposed of the other motion is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has informed us that there is pending a motion that has not yet been disposed of. I recognize the fact that another motion could not be made unless by way of amendment to or substitute for it. My motion being an independent one, I ask for a disposition of the pending motion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMOOT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has been laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for an interrogatory or an observation.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Illinois has stated that he has reason to believe that if his resolution goes before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it will be considered to-morrow. That being true, I do not desire to interpose any delay and I am quite willing that it shall go without further contest to the Foreign Relations Committee. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska, having the Philippine government bill in charge, if he will not consent to laying his bill aside temporarily until that question can be disposed of.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would depend on how long it would take.

Mr. BORAH. I say I do not propose to oppose it, and I do not think anyone else does.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I still am in a dilemma, if the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee insists there is pending a motion which precedes my own. If it does not, I now move that Senate concurrent resolution 9 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE. Of course, that motion can not be made while the unfinished business is pending, but if the Senator from Nebraska will accede to the request of the Senator from Idaho and agree to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, I would be very glad, if it can be done without debate, to have both these resolutions referred.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would be very glad to pursue that course, if it can be done without debate.

Mr. LEWIS. As far as I am concerned, I have no observations to make upon the resolution I submitted.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that these resolutions may be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that course?

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Nebraska also include the resolution which I have offered upon identically the same subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will, under the same conditions, without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. STONE. Except, Mr. President, I want to say, after the remark of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that he consents to the reference of the resolution at this time and in this way to the Committee on Foreign Relations under the impression or expectation that it is to be taken up and disposed of to-morrow morning by the Foreign Relations Committee, that may or may not be correct. I would not like to have the Senator give consent, as he says he does, under any misapprehension.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri, who is chairman of the committee. Will he concede that we shall take it up to-morrow and dispose of it when we may?

Mr. STONE. I concede that to-morrow is the day of meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. There is a mass of matter before the committee. The Senator from Idaho being a member of the committee can call it up if he wishes, but what disposition the committee will make of it I am not authorized or prepared to assert, nor do I think the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Idaho can do that. It will be for the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to say that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Idaho may call it up if the Senator from Missouri does not lay it before the committee, but there is another remedy in case that is not done. So I will not object to the request of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have asked the unanimous consent of the Senate that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying aside the Philippine government bill temporarily? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LIPPITT. That has been done, has it not?

Mr. STONE. It is done now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now temporarily laid aside. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I now move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 be committed to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. STONE. Let us see. Wait a moment. Did the Senator move that the Senate concur in the resolution?

Mr. LEWIS. The resolution submitted by myself is a concurrent one. I now am moving to have the resolution introduced by myself sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it is a concurrent resolution, as distinguished from the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], which is a Senate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the concurrent resolution being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations? If not, it will be so referred.

Mr. STONE. Now, I ask that the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, which has been the subject of consideration this morning, be likewise referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, I ask that the Philippine government bill be again laid before the Senate.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I believe the time has now come when the Senate can consider the committee amendments. I ask that the first one be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment of the Committee on the Philippines.

The SECRETARY. On Page 5, line 10, strike out the words "polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited" and insert:

Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 15, strike out the words: That the rule of taxation in said islands shall be uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I want to ask the Senator having the bill in charge why that provision is stricken out?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was done for the reason that the provision would possibly invalidate certain lines of taxation which have been in force in the Philippine Islands for some time. It is also in line with the policy of a number of States which recently have withdrawn that prohibition from their constitutions. It will make no change in the policy of the Philippine Islands, because heretofore that limitation has not restrained the lawmaking power.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I am in favor of any legislation that will enhance the interests of the Filipinos or of the islands. I wish that this bill referred only to legislation. I could heartily support nearly all the provisions in it, and in fact I might say I would even go further and grant them a still greater degree of self-government; but in doing so, Mr. President, I do not believe we ought by an act of Congress to lay it down as a rule "that the rule of taxation in said island shall be uniform" or "shall not be uniform." I think any legislation that we pass here affecting taxation in the islands ought to follow the line of our own laws and Constitution.

I believe we ought to announce to the Philippine people that taxation should be uniform, and I thought when I read the bill first before it was acted upon by the committee that that was one of the good provisions of the bill. I am doubtful of the wisdom of striking this provision from the bill. I believe, Mr. President, it ought to be in the bill, because I believe that no matter what country it is, whether the Filipinos or any other people, it ought to be taxed uniformly. There must be some reason other than that which has been stated by the chairman, and, if the chairman really has that information at hand, I would for one like to have him give it to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course it should not be understood that the striking out of this line will be an instruction to the legislative power in the Philippine Islands to make taxation without any regard to uniformity. But it is a new provision. The legislative power of the Philippine Islands heretofore under the authority of Congress has not been restricted by such a limitation. For instance, they have exempted from taxation the property of very poor people there. That would not be possible under a limitation of this sort. There are some forms of taxation which in their nature are not uniform. I thought I could put my hand upon it; I have not been able at the moment to do so, but to put this provision in the act would compel the repeal of taxation laws which have been in effect in the Philippine Islands for many years. They have been inherited in part I suppose from the Spanish régime. So the striking out of this provision creates no new condition in the Philippine Islands, but permits them to run along as they have in the past with a gentle and very mild form of taxation.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I will ask if the provision of taxation in the islands in regard to uniformity is not a part of the organic act.

Mr. SMOOT. I myself was going to ask whether it was in the organic act. If so, of course then it would not be necessary to put it in the bill. But if it is not a part of the organic act it should be here of course, if that should be the future policy of our Government in passing laws for those people.

Mr. STERLING. I hold in my hand the act "temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and one provision is "that the rule of taxation in said islands shall be uniform."

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, if it is in the organic act, I have no objection whatever to having it stricken out. That is the very question I was going to propound to the chairman of the committee when the Senator from South Dakota interrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The next amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 22, strike out the word "city" and insert "cities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 22, strike out the word "Manila," insert the words "Cebu, Iloilo, and Zamboanga."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, lines 7 to 10, strike out the words "prior to the 13th day of August, 1898, held the office of captain municipal, gobernadorcillo, alcalde, tenientes, cabeza de barangay, or member of any ayuntamiento" and insert "under existing law are legal voters and have exercised the right of suffrage."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to make an inquiry in regard to the amendment in italics, "under existing law are legal voters and have exercised the right of suffrage." I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether that means that they must possess both qualifications—those of legal voters and that they have exercised already the right of suffrage—before they are entitled to vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The clause in question as it was originally placed in the bill was merely a repetition of existing law, which gives to any man the right to vote provided he has held one of the unpronounceable offices named in the paragraph. Instead of repeating that, it was thought wise to insert a provision which in substance is that a man should be allowed to vote who heretofore has exercised the right of suffrage. It is merely to simplify the provision.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the chairman of the committee state to the Senate just what offices these are that are being stricken out? It is as clear as mud to me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are for the most part merely municipal offices or offices which correspond to justice of the peace or small tribunals in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, after line 16, insert:

(d) Those to whom the privilege of suffrage may be granted by the Philippine Legislature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, line 26, strike out the word "Bataan" and insert the word "Bulacan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 1, strike out the word "Bulacan" and insert the word "Bataan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 3, strike out the word "Cavite" and insert the word "Laguna."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, lines 3 and 4, strike out the word "Laguna" and insert the word "Cavite."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 20, after the words "nineteen hundred and," strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "sixteen," so as to read:

The first election under the provisions of this act shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1916, and there shall be chosen at such election one senator from each senate district for a term of two years and one for four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 24, after the word "receive" insert the words "until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 1, after the word "services" insert the words "of \$2,000 and \$1,500, respectively."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska a little further as to the advisability of a provision like this. The section provides for annual sessions of the legislature, and then provides for special sessions which may be called by the Governor General. Does not the Senator think that an annual salary of \$2,000 for senators and \$1,500 for representatives in the Philippine Legislature is a little excessive, and that a better method of providing compensation for them would be a per diem compensation with a limitation as to the number of days of the session?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the testimony before the committee indicated that the members of the assembly already receive a compensation which approximates the \$1,500 named in the bill, and it was not thought wise to make any change in that. On the other hand, the committee did not think it wise to leave in the bill the provision that they should receive a compensa-

tion to be ascertained by law, because there might be a disposition to unduly raise their salaries. The salaries of the senators are made slightly higher than those of the lower house, and I think they should be, considering the fact that they represent a larger territory and also because of the fact that they have other duties than legislative duties.

Of course the committee were not well informed as to the cost of living and as to the question whether men of good ability could be secured for this service at a lower salary, but in order not to disturb existing conditions and permit them to receive substantially what they have received in the past the amount was left as stated in the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it is my impression that the amount which they are receiving now is about \$2,000 to \$2,500 each. It is a per diem of \$30—\$15—a day while they are in session. The bill as introduced at the last session provided for \$2,000 for representatives and \$2,500 for senators. My impression is that this session it was introduced for the same amounts and we changed it. I do not see any change indicated in the bill, but evidently the amount is lower than it was in the bill which was in this body in the last Congress. That is not a large amount. They have to come great distances; transportation there is not cheap and is very difficult. A great deal is overland; a great deal is over paths instead of good roads. We thought, all things considered, that \$2,000 and \$1,500 would not be out of the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 2, to strike out the words "ascertained by law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 22, after the word "who," insert "in case he shall then not approve."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the same is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 16, after the words "nineteen hundred and," strike out "fifteen" and insert "sixteen," so as to read:

SEC. 21. That the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands shall, on the first Tuesday in June, 1916, and at the general elections thereafter provided for the election of senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature, elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who shall hold their office for a term of four years beginning with the first Monday in the month of December following their election, and who shall be entitled to an official recognition as such by all departments upon presentation to the President of a certificate of election by the Governor General of said Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. That concludes the committee amendments, the Chair is informed by the clerks at the desk.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I am not certain but it will be necessary to change the language on page 13, lines 10 and 11, and I will take the liberty of reserving an exception there when the bill gets into the Senate for further conference with the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not understand that the amendments in the preamble of the bill have been agreed to. That comes later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the question of the preamble will come after the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that is the case under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to ask the Senator about section 30, page 29, of the bill, which covers the matter of jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases of appeal. The language is:

That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved.

That language is all right so far as it applies to the Constitution or a statute or treaty, but it seems to me that the language is inappropriate as applied to the further expression "title, right, or privilege of the United States." What, I presume, is meant is a title, right, or privilege claimed under the United States.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I referred to that the other day. It seems to me what was intended is the Constitution or any statute, treaty, right, or privilege under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; or statute.

Mr. KENYON. There is something evidently missing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It should be "in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved or any title, right, or privilege claimed under the Constitution or any statute or any treaty of the United States."

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It certainly does not mean a case where the right of the United States is involved or the privilege of the United States is involved. What does the Senator from Nebraska say about that?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that is merely a reenactment of the organic act. I was endeavoring to see if that is not correct or whether the language is inaccurate. I think, perhaps, I can turn to it in a moment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, following the language used in our own legislation, it would be "which the Constitution or any statute treaty or right or title under the Constitution or statute is involved or any right, title, or privilege under the Constitution or statute of the United States." It is undoubtedly an inadvertence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think so.

Mr. CLAPP. Even if it be in the organic law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Was it in the organic law?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know; but we should follow the usual language used in our own Constitution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For example, I have before me now the language used with reference to appeals from decisions of the highest court of the State. That language is section 237 of the code:

A final judgment or decree in any suit in the highest court of a State in which a decision in the suit could be had, where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of or an authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against their validity; or where is drawn in question the validity of a statute of or an authority exercised under any State on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, and the decision is in favor of their validity; or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity—

The word "immunity" is also omitted—

or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, or any treaty or statute of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that the matter be passed over until the language can be formulated in accordance with the custom with reference to our own laws. I do not think there is any question about this being an inadvertence.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I find that I am correct—that section 30, to which the Senator calls my attention, is a reenactment of section 10 of the organic act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Still the language is unfortunate and inappropriate even in the organic act, because what is intended evidently is only to include a case where a title or right or privilege is claimed by somebody under the United States. It is not a title or right or privilege of the United States, but of some person or corporation claimed under the Constitution or the laws or a treaty of the United States. That obviously is what is intended, and the bill ought to be made to conform to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it would be a statute of the United States or a treaty of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Or a title.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. CLAPP. It would be a right, privilege, or title claimed under the United States. There is not any question but that the use of this language must have been an inadvertence in the first instance. I suggest that the matter be passed over temporarily until the proper language can be framed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I notice in the bill there has been an inadvertence in the fixing of a certain date; and I desire to move to strike out, on page 20, line 12, the words "first Monday in December, 1915," and to insert in lieu thereof "4th day of March, 1917." This language relates to the time that the two Resident Commissioners to the Congress of the United States shall hold office; that is the time when their commissions expire. These words were placed in the bill two years ago and are entirely inapplicable now, because the year 1915 has passed. It seems to me the date for the expiration of the office of these commissioners should be the end of the

term for which they were elected. For that reason I move the amendment which I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out the word "first Monday in December, 1915," and to insert the words "4th day of March, 1917," so as to read:

The present two Resident Commissioners shall hold office until the 4th day of March, 1917.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 12, after the word "prohibited," it is proposed to insert:

That no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am informed that since the Philippine Islands came into the possession of the United States liquor has been sold or is being permitted to be sold there in what we call saloons. I am also informed that in no period prior to the time the United States became the owner of those islands was there any liquor sold in saloons in the islands. I am further informed that the Philippine people can not be considered as a drinking people or as a people who care for intoxicating liquors as a beverage. I think it is now our duty at least to leave the islands in the condition in which we took them. I think that both from a moral and economic standpoint we should say, and say explicitly, that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall be prohibited in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. President, I am glad to be able to say that I come from a State that has never had within its borders, since it became a State, a saloon. We have for more than a quarter of a century had prohibition in the State of North Dakota, and discussing it from an economic standpoint only, it has been a saving to the people of that State of many millions of dollars. We are trying all over the United States to get rid of the saloons. It is a question that is being discussed in every State of this Union; it is a question with which we must deal not only in the individual States but in the entire Nation; and it seems to me that now is a good time to provide in this bill that no liquor shall be sold or manufactured in the Philippine Islands; especially so, when the Filipinos themselves say that they do not care to have the liquor traffic going on in the islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. The regulation of the question to which the Senator refers, namely, the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Philippine Islands, is now left to the Philippine people themselves and to the Philippine Assembly, is it not?

Mr. GRONNA. I suppose all these regulations, to some extent, are left with the Philippine Assembly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I mean does not the Senator know that under the law as it now stands the Philippine people themselves, through their own assembly, can prohibit the sale of liquor if they so desire?

Mr. GRONNA. To a certain extent that is true, Mr. President; but I simply want to put the islands in the same condition in which they were prior to the time the American people took possession of them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. I gladly yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that the plan of government which the United States is now proposing to give to the Filipino, believing that it will probably be the prototype by which the Filipino will shape his own government when he becomes independent, ought to contain everything that the American Congress thinks will be for the best interests of the Filipino; and, while the Philippine Legislature have the right to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor in the Philippine Islands, I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that it would be wise for the American Congress to start them out without this handicap of the saloon.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be adopted, because the liquor traffic

is a handicap, and the people of the Philippines, who are struggling to establish a government, are entitled to this assistance. The Senator's amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Mr. President, I do not wish further to delay the proceedings of the Senate. I simply ask for a vote on my amendment, unless some other Senator wishes to discuss it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate temporarily when the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota was read from the desk, but I want to say that I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I had the pleasure of spending some time in the Philippine Islands, and, in my judgment, there is no better time than now to give them prohibition. There are not many saloons now in the various towns of the islands; there are a few in Manila and perhaps in some of the other cities, and the time to take action is before the saloons are opened and before the people get the drinking habit. The Filipinos are not a drinking people. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hughes	O'Gorman	Smoot
Beckham	Husting	Overman	Sterling
Borah	James	Owen	Sutherland
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Catron	Jones	Phelan	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Clapp	Kern	Pomerene	Underwood
Colt	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lewis	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Lippitt	Sherman	Weeks
Fletcher	McLean	Shields	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works
Harding	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Neison	Smith, Ga.	
Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, Md.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am authorized to say in behalf of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], who is absent, that he is confined to his house through illness.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is absent from the city, but is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. STERLING. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota] is unavoidably detained from the Senate Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. CATRON. My colleague [Mr. FALL] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. GRONNA. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in regard to this amendment, inasmuch as few Senators are here now who were present at the time it was proposed. This is an amendment to the Philippine bill which proposes to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or importation of intoxicating liquors of all sorts. My first objection to it is that this is a bill to authorize the Filipino people to legislate for themselves; but the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is legislation that Congress heretofore has never attempted to impose upon the Philippine people. In so far from that, Mr. President, the whole course of American Government in the Philippine Islands has been to recognize local customs, to recognize existing conditions, to interfere as little as possible with the habits of the people, and to make them content under the present conditions.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the organic act under which we are now operating in the Philippine Islands. It provided at the opening:

That the action of the President of the United States in creating the Philippine Commission and authorizing said commission to exercise the powers of government to the extent and in the manner and form and subject to the regulation and control set forth in the instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission, dated April 7, 1900, is hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed, and until otherwise provided by law the said islands shall continue to be governed as thereby and herein provided.

What were the instructions of the President of the United States to the commission which he sent out to the Philippine Islands? Let me quote:

In all the forms of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe the commission shall bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands; and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government.

Mr. President, under that instruction of President McKinley, which now has practically the force of law by reason of being included in the organic act, the people of the United States have permitted to continue in the Philippine Islands some 44,000 establishments where the native drinks of the Philippine people are sold as groceries are sold, such drinks as vino, such drinks as basi, tuba, and topuy. This amendment will make it impossible either to manufacture or sell those drinks to which the Philippine people for generations have been accustomed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Undoubtedly the Senator from Nebraska is more familiar with the conditions in the Philippines than am I, but I have been informed on very good authority that the Philippine people are not a drinking people; that they do not care for the saloon nor do they care for liquor; that the Filipino people are an abstemious people, a sober class of people; and I thought, Mr. President, that it was only the duty of Congress to enact in this provision in this bill, which, in reality, is only an addition to or a plank in the constitution of the Filipino people. The Senator from Nebraska, I suppose, will not maintain that Congress has no right to adopt such an amendment as this. Is that the view taken by the Senator?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, no; I am not claiming that Congress has no such right; but I say that this provision is entirely inconsistent with this bill, which proposes to give to the Filipino people a larger measure of legislation, while the amendment of the Senator proposes to take away from them some powers they have heretofore possessed.

Mr. President, I may say that the Senator is correct when he declares that the Filipino people are not a drinking people in the sense of becoming drunkards. They drink their native wines, as they eat their fruit and their other foods, in moderation; drunkenness is not an evil in the Philippine Islands among the Philippine people, and the testimony before the Philippines Committee indicated that fact and led the committee to reject the amendment which the Senator from North Dakota proposes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not yield for a speech, only for a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not going to make a speech. I only want to make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska: The same objection which he urges against the adoption of this amendment or one similar to it might be urged against the adoption of a prohibition law affecting the States of the Union. Whisky has been sold in some of the States for 100 years or more. There is, however, this further fact to be considered: While the Filipinos may not be a drinking people now, if the saloons are permitted to be opened there under American control and our civilization shall be forced upon them, the appetite will be created as a business enterprise. I think it is a duty of this Congress to protect the people of the Philippine Islands against such an insidious enemy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech; I only yielded for a question.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska what is the nature of the drinks which he says are peculiarly Filipino drinks, and what is the nature of the liquor which the Filipinos use? Is it such as is ordinarily sold in American saloons?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not. There is some sale of American drinks in the Philippine Islands—some sale of beer and some sale of whisky—and some beer is made in the Philippine Islands and was made there for a great many years under the Spanish occupation, but it has not been consumed by the Filipino people to any extent, nor is whisky consumed by the Filipino people. The amendment which the Senator from North Dakota has offered would strike down, as I have said, all of

the small retail establishments, such as grocery stores and provision stores, where three or four kinds of native drinks are sold. For instance, it would destroy the trade in tuba, which is a drink taken directly from the coconut palm, I think, a drink which at the time it is extracted is absolutely without any alcoholic effect, but which gradually becomes stronger. It would strike down the trade in basi, which, I believe, is made from rice, and would strike down the trade in tapuy, which, I think, is a provincial drink used only in part of the islands. I think that the amendment which the Senator offers is so sweeping, so destructive, as to strike at the very habits of the Filipino people when there is no evil to be struck at. I think it would cause resentment and cause a great deal of disturbance in the islands.

There is a lesser evil which would grow out of it, to which I may refer. It would destroy one-sixth of the Philippine revenues, and they are not very large, and they are having a hard time, as they are a poor people, in getting on as it is. They derive from customs duties at the present time something like \$300,000 a year on imports into the islands, chiefly from the United States.

Mr. BORAH. From imports of liquor?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume so; from imports of wine and beer, and probably whisky. It would destroy an internal revenue amounting to something over \$3,000,000, \$3,832,000 in 1914, which is an internal-revenue tax on the 44,000 retail establishments where these native drinks are sold.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows how many saloons are in operation in the Philippine Islands at the present time?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I have heard that the saloons in the Philippine Islands are practically confined to Manila and to two or three other towns. Probably the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], who has recently visited the islands, if not the saloons, may be able to tell us. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will state that my understanding is that in nearly all the large cities and towns—and there are a number of large towns in the islands—where there is an American population there are saloons in limited number, but not to the extent that they are found in this country.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Philippine people may not be a drinking people now, but, if the American saloon is allowed to prevail there for very long, they will probably become a drinking people.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator made the remark that this was passed on by the committee. I do not understand that it was considered by the committee. It certainly was not while I was present in the committee room.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should say to the Senator from Minnesota that this bill was considered by the committee at the previous session of Congress, before the committee was favored by the addition of the Senator from Minnesota. It is very true that it was not considered at the recent session.

Mr. CLAPP. At this session we did not consider it; but, as I understand the situation out there, the Filipinos themselves are not what might be called a drinking people. The drink that they make is consumed, I understand, very largely by the so-called non-Christian tribes. I should have no hesitation at all, so long as we assume to govern these people, about withholding from the Filipinos the right to traffic in liquor with the less intelligent, less civilized portion of their population.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska stated a moment ago that to impose this limitation upon the Filipinos would not be consistent with the bill which we are engaged in considering, and which has for its purpose the enlargement of the rights and privileges of that people. The Senator recognizes, of course, that in the bill itself we have denied to the Filipinos the right to legislate upon a great variety of subjects. Here are 14 or 15 paragraphs devoted to one purpose—to limit the power of the Filipino government in legislating respecting themselves.

For instance, the Senator has just had adopted an amendment to this bill which prohibits polygamy, in the future, at least. We are in that way curtailing the right of the Filipino people to determine what is best for themselves. We prohibit the legislature there from making any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of it. We are prohibiting the legislature there from using any of the public money for the benefit or support of any religious organization. We are prohibiting slavery. We are providing that no law shall be passed that will restrict or abridge the freedom of the press; and so I might proceed almost indefinitely.

I mention this in order to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is entirely consistent with the theory of the bill, if we believe it is not wise for the Filipino Legislature to authorize the liquor traffic; and it seems to me that it is a question for the judgment of the Members of the Senate with regard to the best interests of these people. If we believe in prohibition, we ought to impose it upon the Filipino people. If we do not believe in prohibition, then we ought not, I assume, to impose it.

For myself, I very much favor the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, for that is the condition that I would have prevail in those islands. In doing it we have pursued exactly the same course that the committee has pursued in regard to all of these important matters which constitute a limitation upon the power of the Filipino Legislature.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to yield, although I recognize that I have no right to yield.

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator says he thinks that if we are in favor of prohibition we would have the right to prohibit the sale of liquor in the Philippines, and that if we are not in favor of prohibition we would not have that right.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I said that if we are in favor of prohibition, those of us who are in favor of prohibition ought to vote to impose that policy on the Philippine Islands. Those of us who are not in favor of prohibition might well hesitate before they would vote to establish there a policy which they refuse to establish at home.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was only going to suggest to the Senator that, inasmuch as this Senate has declined to impose prohibition on our own country, it would seem rather inconsistent to impose prohibition on a foreign country, and one so far off.

Mr. CUMMINS. I supposed we had not declined as yet.

Mr. LIPPITT. This particular Senate, it is true, has not; but its predecessor did so decline.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator mean with regard to the District of Columbia bill?

Mr. LIPPITT. No; I think there was a measure before the Senate providing for national prohibition. I will say that I am corrected. I find that such a proposal was made and was referred to a committee, and the committee never reported it, which is a very strong demonstration of the fact that the Senate was not in favor of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator refer to the proposed constitutional amendment?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I can give the Senator from Rhode Island reasonable assurance that the committee to which it is now referred will report it and that the Senator will have an opportunity to vote upon it before very long.

Mr. LIPPITT. That may be, Mr. President; but the fact remains that while the subject has been suggested to this Senate as applicable to our own people we have so far declined to take action upon it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the question which the Senator from Iowa started to ask me has grown into rather a large affair. The gist of his point is that it is inconsistent for us, while imposing certain limitations on the Filipino Legislature, to refuse to impose this limitation. Now, the Senator from Iowa is in error. All of the limitations imposed upon the Filipino Legislature by the bill now before the Senate are in accord with existing limitations in the control of the islands; but the prohibition amendment which is offered by the Senator from North Dakota is a new and stringent limitation, tending to interfere with and uproot their local customs, tending to destroy their revenues, and throw the islands into confusion.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There is nothing in the organic act which imports or gives it the nature of inerrancy, is there? What is the objection, even though this provision is not in the original draft, to perfecting it by putting this in the proposed act?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My objection I have stated, Mr. President. It is that it will inevitably result in social confusion in the islands by attempting to enforce upon them something which it will require armies of officers to do. It tends to destroy their innocent habits of life, which involve no evil of drunkenness. It destroys one-sixth of the revenues of the Philippine Islands, and it strikes at an evil which does not exist there.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator think that the saloon business there is as sacred and as highly prized by the Filipino as the right to a multiplicity of wives, or polygamy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This does not limit itself to the saloon evil. There are saloons existing in only five or six of the leading towns, and only very few in them. This amendment, however, strikes at 46,000 institutions, little provision stores, which are not saloons in the American sense.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will it interrupt the Senator for me to ask him a further question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are not the drinks sold by these little stores of the same nature and character as the stuff which is sold in the saloons?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It will not disturb the ordinary trade of the little store. It will only prohibit the little store from dealing in this poison. No; it will not hurt the business of the little storekeeper. On the contrary, it will promote the legitimate business of the little store, because the money that would be spent for the poisonous drink would probably be spent for groceries for the family use if the drinks were not on sale.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is this difference: The Filipino comes into one of those 46,000 stores and buys his cigarettes, puts down a cent, gets a drink of vino or tuba, and goes out. He goes there to buy his provisions. It is not a saloon in the American sense at all. If this amendment proposed to strike only at the few saloons that have been brought in by Americans, and that exist there largely by reason of American patronage, that would be a different thing; but the amendment goes entirely too far. It strikes at the very habits and customs of the Philippine people, and it will inevitably breed disorder.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Under the existing law in force in the Philippine Islands, I suppose the Legislature of the Philippine Islands now is perfectly competent to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors if it pleases to do so?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is entirely competent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will ask the Senator whether or not any sentiment that the Senator knows anything about has developed in the Philippine Islands in favor of prohibition?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not think it has been an issue. I am not prepared to answer, because I have never heard anything on the subject; but such witnesses as we had before the committee indicated that it was not an evil existing there among the Philippine people.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. May I suggest to the Senator that there is a prohibitory law there now as to the non-Christian tribes, passed by the Philippine Assembly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is a law?

Mr. KENYON. There is a law there now. All this is doing is imposing upon the Christians what they have imposed upon the heathen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator mean by that a law which forbids the sale of liquor to uncivilized tribes; or what does he mean?

Mr. KENYON. To what are termed the non-Christian tribes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The uncivilized tribes?

Mr. KENYON. Well, yes; as we commonly call them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is in line with the legislation which we have always passed in this country to prohibit traffic in intoxicating liquors with the Indians.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But that law does not apply, as I understand, to the civilized and intelligent people of the islands.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, are we to understand from the statement of the Senator from Iowa that the only way to get a drink in the Philippine Islands is to get religion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know. The Senator from Iowa can answer that question.

Mr. KENYON. I think I stated before that the only way to get a drink there is to become a Christian.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before I take my seat I want to say simply a word about the proposed amendment.

I take it that the Congress of the United States does not desire to make itself ridiculous, even upon the subject of prohibition. If we put this provision into the proposed legislation, it will be absolutely meaningless. What penalty is prescribed for its violation?

Suppose we write this provision into the law and somebody in the Philippine Islands continues to sell intoxicating liquor and somebody else buys intoxicating liquor. What is going to happen? We will have simply a moral principle in this law, by way of gentle admonition, that "no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage." There is no penalty attached to it and no method of enforcing it. It is an absolutely meaningless thing. It is not even a limitation upon the Legislature of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Utah says is true. It is simply an expression, I take it, largely of opinion and sentiment. But what he has just said with regard to the effect of this amendment, if it were adopted, is also true of the amendment the committee has proposed, and which has been adopted by the Senate, with regard to polygamy. There is no penalty for it. There is no punishment provided. I take it that it is simply a proclamation that we do not believe in polygamy, ordinarily speaking.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; what the Senator says is probably true, that neither of these provisions amount to anything. But what earthly sense is there in solemnly writing into a law which is supposed to have some meaning and some effect a statement of this kind, which is simply a declaration of our opinion about a moral principle?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senate, as I understand, has already adopted the amendment proposed by the committee prohibiting polygamy without prescribing any penalty for the violation of it. Is that true?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is no reason why we should keep on loading down the law with provisions of that sort.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator from Utah that if he really believes this amendment ought to be adopted, it will take but a very few moments to add a penalty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let the law be complete, then. Let us not vote upon a proposition of this kind. Let us frame a law that will cover the subject, or let us leave it alone.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has demanded the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a moment ago I asked the Senator from Nebraska something about some of the drinks which are peculiarly Filipino drinks. I find in the hearings some evidence which throws some light upon his matter, and I will read it:

The CHAIRMAN. How about the habit of the people in regard to drinking? Do they drink to excess? I am speaking of the Moros.

Col. YOUNG. Not at all. They have a drink there called vino, which is a native drink. If a white man drinks it it sets him crazy. The Moro will not drink it at all, but he will sell it to other people. You can buy enough to make everybody drunk for 5 cents. All the Moro wants is to get the 5 cents, but he will not drink it himself.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it made of?

Col. YOUNG. It is made of the milk of the coconut. They put it out in the sun and let it stand there. Then the Moro will put anything he happens to have into it, a little alcohol, for instance.

Senator LIPPITT. A second time?

Col. YOUNG. A second time, or tobacco or anything else.

The CHAIRMAN. While you were there did you permit them American drinks, whisky and beer?

Col. YOUNG. No. I never saw a Moro drunk in my life. They do not drink. I have heard that there have been cases of that kind, but they just do not drink—

And so forth.

Mr. President, I only want to say that my interest in the proposed amendment arises out of the fact that I should like to be helpful in preventing what is known as the American saloon

from going into the Philippine Islands. If the amendment could be so drawn as to distinguish between those drinks which are peculiarly Filipino drinks and such as come under the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, I should feel considerably as the Senator does in regard to leaving the matter for their determination, as they seem to have control of it and indulge in drink very little. I do think, however, that as the American saloon is entering that field, it is the business of the American people to keep that singular instrument of evil from among those people. It was not there, as I understand, before we went there. It has gone into the Philippine Islands with American civilization; and I feel quite sure that we would do the right thing if we would prevent its spreading and establishing itself throughout the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has the Senator from Idaho observed—and it is entirely in harmony with what he has just stated—that under this bill it would not be possible for the Filipino Legislature to exclude importations of intoxicating liquor from the United States?

Mr. BORAH. It would not be possible?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would not be possible.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has the Senator noticed that?

Mr. BORAH. I understand that to be true; yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. So that we could flood that country with our liquor, even though they were strongly opposed to the practice.

Mr. BORAH. It might be, Mr. President, that it would be well to leave the Filipino to his habits and to the tastes and appetites which he has heretofore acquired. It might be well not to undertake by law to deal with those things. Perhaps it would be wiser to deal with their peculiar drinks in an educational and moral way. But I do think that we are under every obligation, from a moral and from a religious standpoint, to prohibit what is known as the American saloon from going into the Philippine Islands. It is bad enough here at home; surely, it ought not to be permitted to establish itself among a primitive people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if there is one fact which has been established by the nations of the earth, it is that the traffic and sale of intoxicating liquor increases the consumption of it by the people, and the consumption of it by the people is one of the most insidious and deleterious evils with which society is afflicted.

The fact that the importation of this poison is a source of revenue to the Filipino is no argument whatever in its favor. If it is necessary to raise revenue by direct taxation, it would be very much cheaper for the Filipino to run his government in that way than it would be to pay for it in the form of a revenue from the importation of this drug. It is the same old story over again the world over. Whatever is profitable in dollars and cents is of more concern and importance than that which is best for the human being.

The United States has taken over the Philippine Islands for the purpose of developing those people—not for the good of America, not for the profit to be enjoyed by certain enterprises, but for the benefit of the Filipino. He may not be a drinking man now; but we all know that if he is to be held and controlled by the Americans and the American saloon is to be established there the appetite will be cultivated; it will grow, and the enormous profits which are reaped from the business will cause it to spread rapidly over the islands.

I believe it is the duty of this Congress to start the Filipino on the right road. If this amendment carries with it no penalty for its violation, let it go for the moral effect it will have upon the Filipino. It can not do any harm. Every influence that will flow from it will tend to discourage, if no more, the traffic in liquor. It is a condemnation by the American Congress of that miserable business.

I am in favor of destroying the liquor business in America, and if I can not strike it in the face I will hit in the back. If I can not manifest my disapprobation and condemnation of it in any other way, I will hamstring it. I want to embarrass it, because I regard it as the greatest enemy of the human race on earth to-day. It has blighted more lives, it has frustrated more ambitions, it has caused more scalding tears to fall from the eyes of woman than every other evil among men. I believe it is the duty of this Congress, working in the interest of the Filipino, to bring to bear upon him every influence that tends to uplift and benefit him in the management of his own government.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to offer an amendment to this amendment; after the word "beverage" to add:

But this shall not apply to native wines and beverages commonly known as "vino" and the other three which have been named.

Second. That anyone violating this law shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of \$100 or imprisonment for six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

I will add, at the suggestion of Senators, "not more than \$100 and imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I was in hopes that the Members of the Senate would have an opportunity to vote directly upon this question. It may be true, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho would to a certain extent protect the Filipino people from the saloon, but I have been informed that the liquors described in the Senator's amendment are as intoxicating as any liquors manufactured in the United States. Mr. President, it would not stop the trafficking in intoxicating liquors if the amendment of the Senator from Idaho were adopted.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Idaho will let us have an opportunity to vote upon this question directly, and if the amendment which I propose shall be defeated, I shall be very glad to see that we at least protect the Filipino people to the extent of prohibiting the shipment of intoxicating liquors into the Philippine Islands.

But I can not accept the Senator's amendment; nor can I vote for it without having first had an opportunity to vote for the amendment which I presented, which I know would ultimately have the effect of making the Philippine Islands the same as some of the States of the Union—a prohibition territory—and that the trafficking in and manufacturing of intoxicating liquors will be done away with.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota offered an amendment here which, so far as it announced the principle, contained a good principle; but the Senator will agree with me that there is nothing quite so futile and so ineffective as a prohibition against the sale of liquor to which there is attached no punishment. There is nothing in the amendment which would cause any man who desired to sell liquor in the Philippines to hesitate for a moment, and if there is anyone who needs to be reminded that there is punishment in the law it is the man who is engaged in the sale of liquor.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho a question. Does not the Senator think that a bill contracted for liquor in the Philippine Islands would be uncollectible if we should pass this amendment? Would not that in itself discourage the operation of saloons in the islands?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it might in a measure discourage it, but now imagine the effect of the discouragement in an open saloon where the business is being carried on from day to day, where the drink is paid for over the counter at the time it is taken, where the man who offers to buy does not have any disposition to impeach the integrity of the contract under which he gets his drink. It might have an effect of disparaging it as between the wholesale dealer and the saloons to some extent, but how utterly futile would that kind of a law be in the United States even when we add the most drastic penalties. The great argument against prohibition in the United States is that by no method or means can you enforce a law, and if you pass a law which has no penalty attached to it at all and put it upon the Philippine people, who have their own peculiar habits and tastes and appetites, of course they will give no consideration to it.

We are doing, in my judgment, as the Senator from Utah suggested, the same thing. We are, to some extent, advertising our ineffective support of prohibition.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The defect the Senator complains of could be cured very well by eliminating from your amendment the exception, those drinks that are excluded from the operation of the law, and impose a penalty for a violation of the law, as in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. That would meet the Senator's objection.

Mr. BORAH. That should be done, but I think there is much strength in the argument of the Senator from Nebraska, that we ought not to undertake to deal drastically and by punishment without any sentiment being built up in the Philippines in favor of it in the first instance, with those appetites and tastes and habits which have characterized them through years and years.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to ask the Senator from Idaho if he is not willing to divide his amendment? I think the question is divisible anyhow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CUMMINS. That will obviate all the difficulty which has been suggested.

Mr. BORAH. I am quite willing that it should be divided. I mean I am willing to withdraw it until the Senator from North Dakota shall have an opportunity to present his amendment. I do not desire to embarrass it, but I have a great desire to assist in what, I hope, may be effective legislation against introducing into the Philippine Islands the American saloon. I would try in the first instance and until a later day, at least, to confine my legislation to preventing them from acquiring vices not now among them to any marked extent.

Mr. WORKS. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that his proposed amendment does not reach the saloon at all, to which he very frankly says he is opposed. At least we ought, if possible, to exclude the open saloons from the Philippine Islands. I think in that respect his amendment falls short.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand it, these native wines are seldom sold in saloons at all; that is, saloons are not maintained for them, but they are sold in their grocery stores.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will allow me, I would like to suggest to him that it seems to me the adoption of his amendment would look to the Filipinos as though we were inconsistent. His amendment forbids the importation into the Philippine Islands of wine, beer, and whisky, in behalf of temperance, in behalf of prohibition, as our expression is, to the Filipinos, that we believe it is bad for them, yet at the same time it leaves them to drink vino, which, as can be found by reading an excerpt from somebody's testimony, is a drink of such power that by the expenditure of a nickel you can not only get drunk yourself but you can invite your relatives and friends and get them drunk.

Mr. BORAH. I read that statement. Taking it as an entirety, the writer says that the native was entirely too shrewd to drink the stuff and that he did not drink it.

Mr. LANE. No; he sold it to somebody else.

Mr. BORAH. He sold it to the white man or to Americans.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The testimony quoted from the Army officer who was over there was simply in effect that American soldiers bought about five times as much as the native Filipino would buy. The Filipino who takes a drink there takes a cent's worth. The American soldier takes a nickel's worth. He takes five times as much. It is the old American habit of going to excess. There was no testimony at all to show that Filipinos went to any excess.

Mr. BORAH. If I should withdraw the exception with reference to wine, I sincerely hope that the Senator from North Dakota will add something to his amendment which will make it effective. I have no desire to enact merely a sentiment, because it may be sentimentally popular.

Mr. GRONNA. I was going to say to the Senator from Idaho that I shall be very glad to accept that portion of his amendment which provides for a penalty.

Now, as to why I did not provide for a penalty in the amendment which I offered, it was for the reason that I was told by men who I think ought to know the law that the Filipino Legislature could not prohibit the shipment of intoxicating liquors into the islands. For that reason I offered the provision in accordance with the language used to prohibit polygamy. If the Senator from Idaho will modify his amendment so that it will provide only the penalty, I should be very glad to accept it, and I know that friends who are with me in this movement will also accept it; at least I think they will.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho, I understand, has withdrawn his amendment pending action on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. All the Senator from North Dakota has to do is to ask that there be reported as a part of his amendment the language relating to penalties in the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. Let the Senator just use the penalty without the rest of the language.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BORAH. For the present I withdraw it, although I will say that I think a little more reflection upon the part of those who are interested would lead to the conclusion that my amendment would make the bill much more acceptable, because it would prohibit and prevent the acquiring of appetites and practices which they have not got. This law will likely be ignored entirely with reference to those habits and appetites which are characteristic of the Filipino people.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment very much, but it seems to me that the real essence of this question is the fact that in any event we have to trust to the Filipino people and the Philippine government to enforce a law of this kind, if we pass it. It is well known to everybody that the great trouble with the prohibition laws has been the impossibility of enforcing them in communities that are not favorably inclined to them. If we pass this amendment, either with or without the penalty that has been prescribed by the Senator from Idaho, still the ultimate result will have to depend upon the Philippine government to enforce it. You may have a law and you may have a penalty, and if there are not the officers of the law and the various provisions for enforcing it and getting evidence it is a dead letter. We have given to the Philippine people full authority to deal with this question in accordance with their desires. In the organic law now which applies to these islands, in the part of it which was written by President McKinley, he says:

The measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices, to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government.

I quite agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the purpose of this bill is to trust the Filipino people with a larger measure of their self-government. I agree that so far as that is the intention of the bill it carries out the present policy of this Government in the Philippine Islands. It does seem to me that if we are trying to establish the fact whether or not the Filipino people are running their government in a proper method, as near as possible to ideal principles, we can as well trust to them local self-government on the question of the use of liquor as we can in a hundred other points that we are submitting to them for their action and consideration.

I do think it is a little inconsistent for the Senate to impose upon the Filipino people a doctrine that they are not yet ready to impose upon their own people. I do think that to put this law in the statutes and have the Filipino people not in sympathy or the Philippine government not ready to provide the officers and the paraphernalia for carrying it out has a little tendency to bring all the American laws we are making into disrepute. It seems to me, taking those things into consideration, it would be wiser if we did not put this into the law.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. Is the Senator in favor of giving the Filipino the right to govern himself?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have occupied some 10 or 12 columns in the RECORD on that subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would prefer that the Senator should read that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator is complaining that Congress should prescribe for the Filipino in matters of this kind. The Senator says it is inconsistent. I heard the Senator very eloquently and entertainingly on this question, and he took the ground, if I remember correctly, that the Filipino is incapable of self-government and needs the legislative strait-jacket to make him walk in the narrow path.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am sorry that the Senator from Mississippi got that impression of my remarks. What I tried to say, and I hope I did say, was that I thought the experiment, which was once called in Rhode Island the "lively experiment," of giving self-government to the Filipino people up to the point it has now arrived had been a very great success; that it had gone far enough to justify us in hoping that by continuing the same policy for a certain period we might ultimately arrive where the Filipino would be so trained that we could very wisely give him a larger self-government; that perhaps ultimately we might arrive at complete self-government, or whatever you like to use for an expression. I have never said I thought the Filipino people were incapable of being trained for self-government.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I did not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do say I think for the Filipino people it would be unwise at this moment to give them independence. But I think my remarks were perfectly consistent and plain on this subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not conceive of anything that would help the Filipino more in the development of the capacity for self-government than keeping his body sound and his brain clear and sane. There is no effort on the part of Senators who entertain the views I do to tie the Filipino or to limit him in the development of his own Government and his own civilization after the American Government has withdrawn from the Philippine Islands. It is the purpose of this legislation to give him

an idea, to furnish him a plan by which he can organize and build his own civilization. If he wants to go back to the whisky business, if he wants to legalize the whisky traffic after the United States has withdrawn from the islands, that is his affair. I would not proscribe him. I would not limit him in that way; but it is the duty of Congress to help him in so far as Congress can as long as he is a subject and a ward of the Government, and after we turn him loose, then, wishing him Godspeed, let him work out his own salvation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask leave to modify my amendment to strike out that portion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho providing for the exception and inserting the clause which provides for a penalty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the amendment as a proviso the following words:

That anyone violating this law shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will state as a member of the committee that at the last session of Congress we considered this question quite thoroughly, and we came to the conclusion that we did not believe it was best to insert such a provision in the measure. I think I have voted for prohibition on every occasion where I have had an opportunity. I believe in prohibition as applied to ourselves and as applied to any people who pass upon the matter.

But, Mr. President, when we have no prohibition law in the very territory over which we are exercising exclusive jurisdiction, namely, in the District of Columbia, when we have not adopted prohibition as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it comes with poor grace from us to enforce prohibition, without their consent, on people who are 7,000 miles from us and with whose habits and customs we are not familiar.

This is not a permanent measure. It is not intended for a permanent measure. We are simply to legislate and prescribe what the Philippine General Assembly shall do for a limited period of time. It does seem to me that to force a change entirely of their customs with respect to this matter is not wise policy. If those people are very desirous of those native drinks, it will be very difficult to enforce the law.

But, Mr. President, the Filipino does not go into an American saloon. In those saloons the price of the drinks are the same as here, I understand, and it is beyond their ability to buy them. That is one of the reasons they do not drink the American whisky.

But the great objection which it seems to me exists to the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is that we are trying to let those people settle to a large extent their own government and we can not in the temporary occupation that we propose to have under this measure, change their customs, and if we do it would be considered by many a great hardship and wrong.

I have always felt that whenever an alien people attempt to legislate and prescribe limits as to the customs of other people it is hardly fair. These are conditions that exist by reason of their own will. I have not any doubt that the prohibition question will come up in the General Assembly of the Philippines and I have no doubt that they will solve that problem according to the best interests of the Philippine people. We can not consider all the problems and attempt to settle them and fix exactly what they shall do. It seems to me this is a problem which they ought to determine for themselves.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I believe that we ought to leave the bill just as it is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make one further suggestion with reference to the form of this amendment. I suggested a moment ago that if it were adopted in the language written by the Senator from North Dakota, it would be wholly innocuous, that it could not be enforced because no penalty was prescribed. Now, the Senator has offered an amendment, which reads that anyone violating this law shall upon conviction thereof be punished, and so on. The amendment itself is proposed to be inserted on page 5, line 11, of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. I have changed that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Where does it come in now?

Mr. GRONNA. It comes in following the word "prohibited," after "polygamy."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then it comes in after line 12?

Mr. GRONNA. After line 12.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well. Now let us read the proposed law as it will read if this amendment were inserted. Taking that paragraph, it would read:

That no law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed; and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. No public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary or sectarian institution as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited.

That no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage; but this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages commonly known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

Which means, of course, that anybody who misuses public moneys or who does any of these other things, including the contracting of polygamous or plural marriages, or the sale of intoxicating liquors, or any of the other things that I have not stopped to read preceding this amendment, would be liable to this penalty, whereas I suppose the Senator means simply to confine it to the sale of intoxicating liquors or drugs.

Mr. President, that shows the utter futility of trying to frame a law in the open Senate in this manner. I will predict to the Senator from North Dakota that if he will still further amend this law so as to make it clear that the penalty applies only to the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquor, yet the provision has been drawn so hastily that ingenious lawyers will find loopholes through which they can drive a cart and horse. All of which demonstrates the unwisdom of undertaking to legislate in this haphazard way.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say, Mr. President, to the Senator from Utah that of course I expected this to be a new paragraph and that it would apply only to intoxicating liquors and would not apply to anything which the Senator has read.

I will also say to the Senator from Utah that this very amendment itself, in the very same language in which I offered it, has stood the test not only of the State courts but of the Federal courts of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota can very quickly and very easily obviate the objection of the Senator from Utah by the insertion of the words "with relation to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors," and I have no doubt he will be willing to do that.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to accept that suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to say just one word with regard to the position taken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], which seems to me to be very illogical and unsound. We are dealing with the Filipino people upon the assumption that they are not capable fully of managing their own affairs. It is the very foundation stone of this structure that is being reared with such care and patience. If we believe that with regard to this subject they are not yet capable of self-government or self-disposition, it becomes our duty to supply that weakness and do what we can to make society there stable and sober.

But the Senator from Colorado forgets apparently the suggestion I made a few moments ago to the Senator from Idaho. This bill does not leave the Philippine Legislature in possession of the subject at all. It leaves the Philippine Legislature with power to prohibit the importation of liquor from Great Britain, or France, or Japan, or anywhere else, but it denies them the liberty or power to prohibit the importation of liquor from the United States. A most inequitable, unjust, and unfortunate limitation of power on the part of the government about to be established there. I ask the Senator from Colorado, if the committee desired to leave the legislature of the islands with the power to determine the policy that ought to prevail in the islands, does he not think that we ought to give to the authorities there the right to say what the relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands shall be respecting liquor? So long as that is reserved, it is for us, and not for the Philippine Legislature, to declare the policy in this respect. I propound that question to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I believe the Philippine Legislature ought to be given the power to determine whether or not intoxicating liquors shall be shipped from the United States there, and I would be perfectly willing to vote for a provision that authorized that; but the question is whether or not the Philippine Legislature should have this power. The Senator from Iowa has said that these people are incapable of self-government. I do not agree with the Senator in that respect. This is a limitation of power upon the legislature. I want to inform the Senator, though he probably knows it, that every one of the 81 members of the Philippine

Legislature is a graduate of a college or of a university. Consequently, they are perfectly capable of passing whatever laws they think are for the best interests of the Philippine people.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Colorado misunderstood me if he understood me to say that I thought they were incapable of self-government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know that the Senator said so, but I inferred that from what the Senator said.

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary, I said that the theory of this bill was that the Filipinos are not competent to fully and completely govern themselves. I do not agree with the theory of this bill, as the Senator from Colorado certainly well knows.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, Mr. President, every bill is a subject of compromise; there is no doubt about that, nor is there any doubt there are provisions in this bill which do not satisfy me or perhaps any other one man. You can not have legislation in a bill covering 40 or 50 pages to which every one exactly agrees, but I maintain that the position which we are trying to take in the bill is to let the legislature of the Philippine people deal with this question; that it is a question which affects those people. They know more about it than we do and could tell you more about it in a month than I could tell you in a lifetime. Consequently, they are the ones who ought to determine the question. I am satisfied that they are not a drinking people. I have been over there twice and have spent considerable time in the islands, and I never saw a Filipino drunk in my life, although I have been on the streets time and time again. There is no necessity for this great change in policy.

If they are going to be taught self-government, they should be given the opportunity to govern themselves. If they decide that this shall be the policy, well and good; I hope it will be, but I want them to take the action. I do not want this policy to be imposed upon them by a power that they may think is exercising an act of tyranny. For this reason it seems to me that we ought to leave this matter to an intelligent legislature which exists over there; let them determine it. Put whatever provision you desire into the bill giving them the power to prohibit the importation of liquors from the United States; I believe in that. I believe they should have the power to determine that very question; and if the Senator will propose an amendment to permit the Philippine Legislature to determine the question of the importation of liquors from the United States or from the world at large, I shall be perfectly willing to vote for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is rejected, if some other Senator does not do so, I certainly shall offer an amendment removing the limitation that the bill imposes upon the Philippine Legislature with regard to the importation of liquor from the United States; but, inasmuch as I believe it to be a wise policy so long as we are legislating for these islands to establish the fundamental doctrines of organized society, I intend to support the amendment commanding prohibition.

If the Filipino people are not accustomed to strong drink—and I am happy to believe that they are not—they will not be seriously injured if we prohibit them the opportunity to become accustomed to strong drink. We are not destroying ideals; we are not compelling them to move in strange ways or paths; apparently we are simply instituting a policy which they will recognize as just and wise more readily than we seem to have done. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will prevail.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word in further answer to the Senator from Iowa. The question of prohibition in our States has been much discussed, and there are certain classes of our own people who think it is tyranny, that it is oppression, to pass any law which, as they term it, would be an embargo upon their stomachs. They claim it is the violation of an individual right. That contention comes from our own people, and our population is pretty evenly divided on the question, for in most of the States the majority for prohibition is merely a small one.

If some of our own intelligent American citizens feel that we have not any right to legislate as to what they shall eat or drink, and they regard such legislation as an act of tyranny, though I do not think it is, because I believe that the majority have a right to control in that matter—but if such legislation is so regarded by our own people, with how much more force must the same view appeal to the Filipino if he thinks that his rights are invaded by an alien people 7,000 miles away? For that reason, it seems to me, Mr. President, that we ought to let this matter stand where the committee has placed it, and let the Filipino Legislature determine the question. I am satisfied that they will ultimately determine it for the best interests of the Filipino people.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]:

In line 3 of the Senator's printed amendment, after the word "beverage," I move to insert:

But this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages commonly known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

Mr. CLAPP. Just a moment, if the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me. I ask him to withhold his amendment until the Senator from North Dakota perfects his amendment, if he will do so, so as to make his amendment complete in itself.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it is manifest that this bill can not be passed this afternoon or that the vote will not be taken upon it. I think, therefore, it would be prudent to let this matter all go over until morning and give the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] an opportunity to perfect his amendment. I think that course would be in the interest of economy of time and might save trouble in the future, for I do not want to vote on immature legislation. I repeat, we can not finish the bill this afternoon, because there is an agreement to take up the Clarke amendment to-morrow. I think it would be better if we could have the night to consider these amendments; and, from the discussion here this afternoon, I think a proper plan might be evolved.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his amendment to my amendment until my amendment, as perfected, can be stated?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not want my amendment to the amendment to lose its position.

Mr. GRONNA. Not at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will ask the Secretary to state the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota for information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as perfected by the Senator from North Dakota.

The SECRETARY. Mr. GRONNA proposes to perfect his amendment as follows: After the word "beverage," the last word in the printed amendment, he proposes to insert:

That anyone violating this law relating to the manufacture, sale, or gift of intoxicating liquors or drugs shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I offer my amendment, to be inserted in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, after the word "beverage."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "beverage" it is proposed to insert the words:

But this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I can understand why the proponents of this bill do not like to have any more inconsistencies introduced into it than it already contains. I can understand why, if they actually believe that the Filipino is capable of self-government and practically fitted for independence, they should wish to relegate this intoxicating-liquor question to the Filipinos themselves. Believing, as I do, that this is not true, that we are making a serious mistake in greatly enlarging the governmental powers of the Filipinos and in promising them independence at this time, believing that these people are not competent for self-government and that it would be a great mistake for the United States to relieve itself of power while it retains responsibility in the archipelago, I shall oppose the passage of the bill. I shall also oppose the so-called Clarke amendment when it comes up, and upon which I propose to speak briefly later.

I think the experiment in the Philippine Islands by the United States thus far is admitted by everybody to have been a splendid success. Everybody that I have heard speak upon the subject has said that we are doing very well in the Philippine Islands; that we are performing the greatest work that any nation has ever done for a dependent people. Every person whom I have consulted, and who was entitled to speak with authority on this subject because of his personal knowledge, has said that we ought not to hold out to Filipinos the encouragement of independence in the immediate future, and that we ought not to grant them a much larger degree of self-government than they already possess until the experiment that we are conducting has been carried forward further than it is at the present time. Why not continue on the course that is

proving so satisfactory? Why invite more trouble when we already have quite enough?

I recognize that it is the popular thing for some temperance people, prohibition people—and I am of that class, being in favor of practical prohibition legislation where possible—it is popular, I say, to tack prohibition onto all sorts of bills and inject its discussion on every possible occasion. That does not, however, help the cause of temperance. Senators have been insisting that the Filipinos are capable of self-government and that it is oppressive for the United States to impose government upon them, and yet some of these Senators are about to repudiate their own arguments by voting to take away a power which they now possess. I would not at this time greatly enlarge the legislative powers of our oriental wards, neither would I take from them powers which they now possess. Senators in dealing with this question should be reasonably consistent.

We ought to retain the respect of the Filipinos, if possible. The United States certainly should not contribute anything to their detriment, to their injury. Therefore I can see where it would be consistent, according to my theory, of still retaining authority in the islands, to prohibit the importation of liquors into the islands, and for that proposition I can cheerfully vote; but I shall not consider myself less in favor of prohibition or of temperance if I vote against a clear interference with the right of the Filipinos to govern themselves in regard to domestic and local matters, which they have shown ability to handle. I think we would make a mistake by thus interfering; that we would lose the respect and confidence of these people; and while, as I have said, I am going to vote against the Clarke amendment and against the bill, because I think they are both unwise and loaded with trouble not only for us but for the Philippine Islands, I shall vote for an amendment, if I am permitted to do so, to prohibit the importation into the Philippine Islands of intoxicating liquors. I am in sympathy with that proposition. It surely is the duty of the United States to protect these islands from all enemies from without, but inasmuch as it is admitted and uncontradicted that domestic intoxicants are not harming the Filipino, and he has shown sense enough to handle them much better than we handle the liquor question in the United States, I want to leave him in undisturbed control of domestic intoxicants.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. VARDAMAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I do not at the present time see him in the Chamber. So I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I announce that I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He not being present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER (when his name was called). I was paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. My understanding, however, was that the arrangement for the pair expired yesterday, so I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). On all except two propositions connected with this bill I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. He is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with that Senator, and, on account of his absence, withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I can not vote, because I have a pair with him. If I were privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have been requested by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to announce that he is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] and his pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Referring to my last announcement, I wish to transfer the pair which I have with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and with that transfer I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] on business of the Senate.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. If present, I do not know how he would vote; but if I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. CATRON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FALL] is unavoidably absent on account of sickness.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is absent on important business, and, as has been stated by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], my colleague is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. COLT. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. I transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS. My colleague [Mr. LODGE] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] has announced his pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. I wish to add in that connection that the Senator from Delaware is detained at home by illness.

I also wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED], who is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], is absent on urgent and necessary business.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KENYON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence for the day of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Borah	Hardwick	Lee, Md.	Simmons
Bryan	Hitchcock	Lewis	Smith, Ga.
Catron	Holls	McLean	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	James	Page	Townsend
Fletcher	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Underwood
Gore	Kern	Robinson	Wadsworth
Harding	Lane	Shafroth	Williams

NAYS—26.

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Husting	Norris	Swanson
Beckham	Jones	Oliver	Thompson
Chilton	Kenyon	Owen	Vardaman
Clapp	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Weeks
Cummins	Lippitt	Sheppard	
Curtis	Myers	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—38.

Brady	Gallinger	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Goff	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Sutherland
Burleigh	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Reed	Tillman
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shields	Warren
Dillingham	Newlands	Shively	Works
du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	
Fall	Overman	Smith, Md.	

So the amendment of Mr. HITCHCOCK to the amendment of Mr. GRONNA was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. On that the yeas and nays have been ordered, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and its transfer to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I vote "yea."

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, and withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. McCUMBER's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who is unavoidably absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when Mr. REED's name was called). I wish to make the same announcement that I did on the last vote with respect to my colleague [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair which I have before announced, I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). I make the same announcement as before with regard to the absence of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and his pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before respecting my pair, and, on account of my pair, withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair and withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that in my absence I have been paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I should like to transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Curtis	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gore	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Gronna	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones	Polindexter	Swanson
Chilton	Kenyon	Shafroth	Thompson
Clapp	Lane	Sheppard	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	Vardaman
Cummins	Myers	Simmons	

NAYS—23.

Bryan	Hughes	Lippitt	Stone
Catron	Husting	McLean	Underwood
Harding	James	Martine, N. J.	Wadsworth
Hardwick	Johnson, Me.	Newlands	Weeks
Hitchcock	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Williams
Hollis	Lewis	Robinson	

NOT VOTING—38.

Brady	Gallinger	Owen	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Goff	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Sutherland
Burleigh	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Colt	Lodge	Reed	Walsh
Culberson	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Shields	Works
du Pont	O'Gorman	Shively	
Fall	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.	

So Mr. GRONNA's amendment as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 19, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1916.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Samuel Alschuler to be United States circuit judge, seventh judicial circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Tillman D. Johnson to be United States district judge, district of Utah.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

J. William Thurmond to be United States attorney, western district of South Carolina.

H. A. Sawyer to be United States attorney, eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Charles J. Lyon to be United States marshal, western district of South Carolina.

Samuel W. Randolph to be United States marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

W. Burch Lee to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 20.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters:

Edward R. Eberle.
Robert B. Huff.
Andrew L. Huestis.
Malcolm G. Slarrow.
Benjamin S. Gantz.
Raymond N. Hickman.
William D. Alexander.
Homer C. Sowell.
Morton L. Ring.
Raymond M. Bright.
Vernon H. Wheeler.
Louie C. English.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

John D. Ainsworth, Wesson.
Red Thomas, Fordyce.
Alfred Watts, Yellville.

CONNECTICUT.

Willis S. Gilbert, Ridgefield.

FLORIDA.

James A. Haisten, Cocoa.
Richard J. Mays, Monticello.

MARYLAND.

Oscar S. Barrick, Woodsboro.
Joseph Reading, Rockville.
G. Walter Wright, Cambridge.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles T. Farrell, Stoughton.
James H. Hoar, Fall River.
Stephen C. Luce, Vineyard Haven.

MICHIGAN.

George Baskin, Ubly.
Elmer Bremer, Montgomery.
James H. Bush, Norway.
Charles E. Dean, Mesick.
George M. Hubbard, Hudsonville.
Henry McCarty, Fremont.
James McKenna, Sault St. Marie.
Edward J. Marrinane, Grass Lake.
Charles Powers, Saugatuck.

NEW YORK.

Patrick H. Cantillon, Perrysburg.
Claude S. Cooper, Odessa.
Roy E. Dietrich, La Fargeville.
George W. Niece, Port Leyden.
Dominick W. Gilligan, Shortsville.
George F. Ketchum, Warwick.
George W. Salisbury, Phelps.
George Staplin, jr., Mannsville.

OHIO.

Morris Albaugh, Murray.
Peter J. Blank, Canal Fulton.
Michael J. Callaghan, Bellevue.
Lee R. Carman, Belmont.
Emmet H. Dixon, Byesville.
Patrick J. Dunn, Strasburg.
William Hosick, Mineral City.
Albert E. Kroske, Arlington.
M. E. Miskall, East Liverpool.
Perry E. Montgomery, Greenspring.
C. D. Royer, Bowerston.
Daniel W. Rumbaugh, Chicago Junction.
George Russ, Sciotoville.
George N. Young, Tiffin.

OKLAHOMA.

Jessie A. Tucker, Comanche.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Menzo M. Burt, Roulette.
John M. Ebling, Schuylkill Haven.
Percy E. Faust, Weatherly.
Richard O. Heilman, Catasauqua.
P. H. Gherrity, Bellefonte.
Mertie T. Gillies, Devon.
Frank W. McFadden, McKeesport.
Edward S. Laughlin, Oil City.
P. H. Salmon, Moosic.

RHODE ISLAND.

Joseph A. Hughes, Pawtucket.

VERMONT.

Asa C. Oakes, Stowe.

VIRGINIA.

Charles N. Graves, Stanley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whom we live and move and have our being, make us conscious of Thy presence, working in and through us, and of Thy love, manifest in a thousand blessings, new every morning and fresh every evening, that we may go forward with faith and confidence to do the work Thou hast given us to do, and thus be worthy recipients of Thy love and care. So may we honor, praise, and glorify Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL.

Mr. HAMLIN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?